

REACTIONS TO JACOBITISM
in
SCOTTISH ECCLESIASTICAL LIFE AND THOUGHT
1690-1760

by
D. H. WHITEFORD, M.A., B.D.,

A Thesis presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
of the University of Edinburgh in the Faculty of Divinity
May, 1965.



**TEXT CUT
OFF IN
ORIGINAL**

**BEST COPY
AVAILABLE**

**Variable print
quality**

C O N T E N T S

CHAPTER

Page

1	JAMES BY DIVINE RIGHT	1
2	WILLIAM THE DELIVERER	44
3	THE AFFLICTED CHURCH	90
4	UNCERTAINTY UNDER ANNE	133
5	TOWARDS REBELLION	178
6	THE DECISIVE YEARS	239
7	THE JACOBITE CHURCH	293
8	THE SECOND REBELLION	351

BIBLIOGRAPHY -

Manuscripts	425
Pamphlets	428
Printed Books	453

THE JUMBLE OF THE TIMES

The Revolution of 1688 takes second place only to the Reformation in Scottish Ecclesiastical history. Whatever had been the relationship of Presbytery and Episcopacy in the years before 1688, after the Revolution Presbyterianism by its determined opposition to Jacobitism in all its guises was destined to survive as the established Church of Scotland. Episcopacy by its adherence to the Jacobite cause was to suffer virtual annihilation.

In England a coalition of various groups within the nation brought about the Revolution. Whigs and Tories, Established Churchmen and Dissenters were united in their intention to rid themselves of James II. His regime supported by such doctrines as "Divine hereditary indefeasible right", "Passive obedience" and "Non Resistance" had brought constitutional government to a stop. The destruction of these doctrines could only be achieved by Revolution.

Scotland, however, took no leading part in bringing about the Revolution. She was, for one thing, a divided Nation. Lowland Scotland had suffered the full brunt of the tyranny of the Stuarts, and was more than ready to follow the lead of the Southern Kingdom with enthusiasm. Highland Scotland, on the other hand, was still the Scotland of Clan feudalism and hereditary right. Secure in its mountains from the invasion of new ideologies, it was in no way ready to be dislodged from its traditional Jacobite loyalties, while the Churchmen of the

Scottish Establishment, bishops and clergy, remained intransigent in their loyalty to James, King by Divine Right.

When the news of the Prince of Orange's landing at Torbay reached Scotland, Presbyterians in the Lowlands, in turn persecuted, suppressed and, after a fashion tolerated, took violent and defiant action which showed only too clearly their hatred of the old regime.

The Edinburgh mob¹ attacked the new Thistle Chapel at Holyroodhouse, recently fitted out by the King for Popish Worship, and reduced its magnificent carved stalls and costly furnishings to ruins. The students of the College marched to the Cross and there burned an effigy of the Pope. The heads and hands of the martyrs were taken down from the gates of the city and reverently buried.² At Glasgow Cross³ Lord Loudoun, then a student at the University, and a number of his companions, burned effigies of the Pope and the Archbishop of St. Andrews without any opposition. Throughout the Western and Southern shires parties of Cameronian hill-men and groups of angry militant parishioners "rabbed" the Episcopalian incumbents. John Sage,⁴ the Episcopalian pamphleteer, claims that some 200

¹Rule, Gilbert, A Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland. Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets, Edinburgh (1691), p. 35; Wilson, Memorials of Edinburgh, Vol. I, p. 139.

²A Memorial for His Highness the Prince of Orange in relation to the Affairs of Scotland, by Two Persons of Quality (1689).

³MacGregor, G, History of Glasgow, p. 269.

⁴Sage, John, Case of the Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Presented (1690), p. 6.

were rabbled in this way throughout Ayrshire, Clydesdale, Nithsdale and Annandale. His claim is well substantiated by the evidence of the Fasti. In some instances this rabbling was harsh and severe, but by no means as cruel and as brutal as the Episcopalian pamphleteers, Morer, Sage and Munro⁵ made it out to be in writing up these events to gain moral and financial support in England. Gilbert Rule, in his Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland: Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets,⁶ deals in great detail with the individual cases of extreme cruelty which the Episcopalian pamphleteers allege, and produces evidence which severely qualifies their assertions.

While he does not "excuse" or "approve" of the Rabble he points out, fairly enough, that what was done was "not to be compared in cruelty and savage barbarity with what they suffered from the Episcopal party when in power. What was done then was done under colour of law, or connived at by those in power; and was at the instigation of Churchmen". Even Sage admits: "It must be confessed that the Western shires of Scotland have been, and are, the most disaffected Party of the Kingdom to Episcopal Government and have suffered much for the Rebellions which their prejudice against it occasioned".⁷

⁵Sage, Case of the Afflicted Clergy, Preface, p. 2.
Morer, Thomas; Sage, John; Munro, Alex., Account of the Present Persecution in Several Letters (1690)

⁶Rule, A Second Vindication, Preface, para. 6; Leven and Melville Papers, Preface, p. XXIX

⁷Sage, Case of the Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Represented p. 3.

The view of the Cameronian hill-men, who took the law into their own hands, and of Presbyterians generally throughout Lowland Scotland, who made no attempt to undo what the Rabblers achieved, was, simply, that a minister who had denied the Covenants, accepted Episcopacy, and acknowledged the Royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical was no longer fit to remain a parish minister. In most parishes it was not required to use physical violence to be rid of the Episcopal incumbent. In parishes where the old Presbyterian minister had returned and ministered to his people in terms of the Indulgence, the Episcopalian might quietly desert his charge since he knew too well the temper of his people. In instances where this did not take place a show of force was sufficient to oust the minister. The Fasti reveal many instances of incumbents who either deserted or demitted their charges at the Revolution, or who were ousted without any recourse to physical violence. Some of these men went across the Border to England and found a living there. Some went to Ireland. Others quietly took up other occupations in Scotland.

Thomas Moubray,⁸ of Uphall, Alexander Nicolson,⁹ of Bonkyl, James Kynneir,¹⁰ of Annan, Roger Lawson,¹¹ of Ruthwell and Thomas Blair,¹² of Coldstream went to England. Patrick Peacock,¹³

⁸Fasti, Vol. I, p. 233.

⁹Ibid., Vol. II, p. 4.

¹⁰Ibid., Vol. II, p. 241.

¹¹Ibid., Vol. II, p. 258.

¹²Ibid., Vol. II, p. 40.

¹³Ibid., Vol. III, p. 61.

of Ochiltree, Samuel Mowat,¹⁴ of Crawfordjohn, Lauchlan Ross,¹⁵ of Carmichael went to Ireland. The ministers of Hutton,¹⁶ and Caerlaverock,¹⁷ retired to their own properties and lived the life of private gentlemen. Robert Douglas,¹⁸ of Bothwell went off to become the Keeper of the Leighton Library at Dunblane. Norman MacKenzie,¹⁹ of Mid Calder left his parish and became a brewer in Edinburgh.

Where, however, the Episcopal incumbents had taken an active part in bringing their non conforming parishioners to the notice of the authorities, armed men and threat of pistols were used to dislodge the Episcopalian. At Ayr,²⁰ on the 14th June, 1689 a party of armed hill-men "discharged" the Town ministers from ever preaching there again. Robert Symson,²¹ of Galston, had taken steps to persecute some of his parishioners for not attending the parish Church. He was taken from his manse and put through the Irvine water and thrust out of the parish. Robert Boyd,²² of Carmunnock, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, had

¹⁴Fasti, Vol. III, p. 218.

¹⁵Ibid., Vol. III, p. 288.

¹⁶Ibid., Vol. II, p. 206.

¹⁷Ibid., Vol. II, p. 258.

¹⁸Ibid., Vol. III, p. 231.

¹⁹Ibid., Vol. I, p. 177; Rule, Second Vindication, p. 182

²⁰Ibid., Vol. III, p. 9 and 11.

²¹Ibid., Vol. III, p. 39; Rule, Second Vindication, p. 33.

²²Ibid., Vol. III, p. 379; Rule, Second Vindication, p. 28.

been "a great informer and instigator against his parishioners, even sitting with the magistrates on the bench". He was rudely ejected from his manse by some of them in return. Robert Finnie,²³ of Cathcart, had made himself so obnoxious to his people by his persecuting spirit, that on the night the Prince of Orange was proclaimed in Glasgow, his parishioners lit a bonfire outside the manse. The import of which was not lost on Mr. Finnie.

At Keir,²⁴ in the Presbytery of Penpont, Alexander Guthrie had informed against several of his parishioners who had been severely fined as a result. At his instigation also a party of dragoons had been sent to the parish of Irongray where they "killed four men and hung them on a tree". When the chance came he was roughly ejected by his parishioners. Mr. Graham, of Lochmaben, Mr. Brown, of Dryfesdale and Mr. Thompson, of Applegarth had "whispered in the ear"²⁵ of Graham of Claverhouse when he sat on the bench judging Presbyterians for non-compliance. These men were all dealt with by their parishioners in 1689. At Auchinleck²⁶ a party of ninety armed men "rabbed" the minister who had required the protection of a troop of dragoons at his

²³Fasti, III, 332; Rule, Second Vindication, p. 27

²⁴Ibid., II, 317; Ibid., p. 33.

²⁵Rule, Second Vindication, Postscript p. 193, Section 6; Fasti, II, 213, 204, 199.

²⁶Ibid., p. 89; Ibid., III, 3.

installation to the parish in 1684. At Kilmarnock,²⁷ Mr. Robert Bell was dealt with by a well armed party of 200 resolute men, who "required him not to preach any more". They were equally harsh, however, in their treatment of the Presbyterian preachers in the Meeting Houses who had accepted James's indulgence. To the extreme Cameronian mind they too were "Apostates and preachers of the Duke of York's Gospel".

At this stage there was little that the Prince of Orange could have done about the situation in Scotland. There were no troops north of the Tweed, if there had been, their use would only have resulted in bloody disorder. A Proclamation, however, was made from London directing that all men should lay down their arms, and that, till the Convention should have settled the question of Government, the clergy of the established Church should be allowed to remain in their parishes. It had little effect. On the very day that this Proclamation was read in Glasgow,²⁸ the Cathedral was rabbled, and the worshippers dispersed and beaten with snowballs.

"Rabbling" was a spontaneous explosion against a hated Church Establishment. It had neither legal nor ecclesiastical authority behind it. When, however, the new Parliament met it did nothing to undo what the Rabblers had done. It neither restored those incumbents who had been rabbled nor offered them any protection in their legal rights. It declared their

²⁷Rule, Second Vindication, p. 30; Fasti, III, 105.

²⁸Ibid., p. 93.

parishes to be vacant, and deprived them of their stipends.²⁹

This was a most severe sentence if these men were not "enemies to the Government" were they "enemies" or "friends"? During the debate in Parliament upon their Petition to the Commissioner for protection, this question was put by Lord Cardross. On the demonstration of their relationship to the new Government much was to depend. The issue was not left in doubt for long.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL REGISTER

On 13th April, 1689, the Estates issued an order that the parochial clergy should on pain of deprivation read from their pulpits the Proclamation of the new King and Queen, and should pray for King William and Queen Mary by name.

This was the crucial test. When faced with it the great majority of the Episcopal incumbents still in possession of their parishes refused. Where this refusal had taken place the Privy Council asked for information to be laid before it concerning the conduct of the defaulting ministers. "The Privy Council Register for 1689"³⁰ shows some 200 cases which

²⁹Sage, John, Account of the late Establishment of Presbyterian Government by the Parliament of Scotland (1690); Petition of the Ministers who were thrust from their Churches by force and violence in December 1688, or at any time thereafter, before the 13th day of April, 1689. Unto His Grace their Majesties Commissioner, and the Honourable Estates of Parliament: Proclamation of Estates 13th April, 1689, deprived of stipends etc. p. 55, Petition, p. 56-75 Debate in Estates.

³⁰Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, Vol. 14 (1689) Introduction, p. XVII.

appeared before it on charges of not reading the Proclamation and not praying for King William and Queen Mary.

Many of the ministers charged defended themselves before the Privy Council with great skill. They pleaded that they had been given insufficient time to decide on a matter of such weight and importance.³¹ They pleaded that the Sheriffs of the Shires had not sent the Proclamation in time. They pleaded that the Proclamation had not been ordered to be read by the legally constituted Church authority.

Dr. Strachan,³² of Edinburgh University, defended himself on the ground that since William and Mary had not yet taken the Coronation Oath they could not be considered King and Queen until they had done so; and, therefore, could not be prayed for by name as King and Queen. But many had not only refused to read the Proclamation as the law required, they had also made some irrevocable declarations from their pulpits in favour of the exiled King. The mass of evidence of this kind which the Privy Council Register contains, shows clearly where the loyalty of the Episcopal party lay.

William Nasmyth,³³ of Eckford, had prayed deliberately for the restoration of King James, destruction to his enemies, and that "God would take the Usurper (King William) out of the way". James Lumsden,³⁴ of Lauder, had prayed that "God would give him (James)

³¹Sage, Case of the Afflicted Clergy, p. 11-16

³²Ibid., p. 13

³³Fasti, II, 110

³⁴Ibid., II, 154.

the neck of his enemies and the hearts of his subjects". William McKechnie,³⁵ of Bonhill, told the Council that "he had taken an oath to King James and would not obey King William's authority", and had also encouraged others "to disown the authority of their present Majesties". Dr. William Gairns,³⁶ of the Tolbooth, Edinburgh, prayed for the King and Queen "as one would do for a thief going to the gibbet", which was regarded as "a manifest contempt of the Estates in not owning King William and Queen Mary as our King and Queen". Mr. David Guild,³⁷ minister of the West Kirk, was accused of being a "spy and intelligencer" for the Castle, and of having directed the fire of the Castle guns. "For which cause the said Mr. David was noticed and seized by the guards and kept prisoner all night in the weigh house". He also, it appears, had been pretty plain in his speech to his parishioners, and had reproached and upbraided "several who were well affected to the Government calling them whoares and rogues, and wearing and showing pistols under his coat, things most unsuitable in a minister and contrair to the express acts of Parliament".

John Barclay,³⁸ minister at Kettle, instead of reading the

³⁵Fasti, III, 331.

³⁶Privy Council Register, 1689, Vol. 14. Sederunt 17th Sept. p. 287

³⁷Ibid., Sederunt 16th August, p. 59

³⁸Ibid., Sederunt 27th August, p. 106.

Proclamation and praying for William and Mary, had expressed himself in these terms. "That he trusted in God to see the late King James on his throne, and that he would be in Scotland against the 4th of June next with a brave army". When news reached his parish that Major General McKay had been defeated at Killiecrankie, "he most affectionately prayed for the restoration of the late King James, and that God would confound and defeat all his enemies, and still continues to do so, and to poison all the people with the same principle". In addition, Mr. Barclay had made his manse "a cabballing place for those who were disaffected to the Government", and had invited to preach from his pulpit some of his brethren "who had been actually deprived of their benefice and office". The Privy Council decided that "the continuation of such a person in the ministerial function especially in that place of the country might prove very pernicious and extremely disadvantageous to the interest of the present Government".

Mr. John Lambie,³⁹ minister of Ecclesgreig, "did not only pray publickly for the late King to have him restored to his throne and to make him a nursing father in this Zion, but also kept constant correspondence and intelligence with the late Viscount Dundee and the other rebels". He had also helped to convey safely Mr. David Graeme, Dundee's brother, to Marykirk, and had persuaded the minister there to send his Reader to warn the rebels that "Sir John Lanier was upon his march from Brechin to Forfar to

³⁹Privy Council Register, 1689, Vol. 14. Sederunt 10th September, p. 241

attack them". William Irvine,⁴⁰ later non Jurant Bishop of Brechin, left his parish of Kirkmichael to join Dundee at Killiecrankie. He was captured and put in prison but managed to escape to France. Robert Stewart,⁴¹ minister of Balquidder, went to Killiecrankie in support of Viscount Dundee, but declined to appear before the Privy Council when summoned to do so for this action. John Murray,⁴² minister of Scone, was unable to take the field himself, but sent his brother to the battle with these words: "Gods curse, and my curse befall you, if you leave the Viscount until you return victorious".

On 7th November, 1689, the Privy Council dealt with five ministers⁴³ from the Presbyteries of Strathbogie and Turriff, namely, Sir James Strachan, of Keith, Mr. Arthur Strachan, of Mortlach, Mr. John Henderson, of Deskford, Mr. John Hay, of Rathven, and Mr. Patrick Chalmers, of Boyndie. They were accused of certain specific acts, - omitting significant clauses from the Proclamation, or influencing and pressing men in their parishes to join in the Rebellion.

The real gravamen of the charges brought against them was summed up in the following extract from the proceedings:

⁴⁰Fasti, III, 44.

⁴¹Ibid., IV, 337.

⁴²Ibid., IV, 251.

⁴³Privy Council Register, 1689, Vol. 14. Sejerunt 7th November, p. 466.

"They had shaken off all fear of God and adherence and respect to the Protestant religion and the due reverence and alledgeance they owe to their present Majesties, the glorious instrument of our delivery from Popery and arbitrary power, they were so far from evidencing the just sense they ought to have had of his Majesty's preservation of our religion and of our relief from these grievous circumstances the nation groaned under", that "in contempt" for all these things they "prayed daily for the late King and his restoration to the throne".

Rumour was spread about in England that the Episcopal incumbents were being deprived in Scotland not for their breach of law "but only for Episcopacy". Rule says in answer to this rumour: "On the contrary, we can show that such as have suffered by the State, did suffer for their breach of the law of the Nation, in not owning the King and Queen as the law required".⁴⁴

The Second charge brought against the action of the Council was that it allowed charges of a scandalous or immoral character to be included in the information laid before it. This, undoubtedly, was the case, but Rule declares that no charges of this nature were ever considered by the Council. "The Council did not consider their immorality, nor freedom from it, but only their obedience or disobedience to the law".⁴⁵ The evidence of the Privy Council Register supports his contention.

Unlike the proceedings of the Council in Carstares' day, when the boot and the thumbscrew were in fashion, the Register

⁴⁴Rule, Second Vindication: An Answer to a late Letter concerning the Sufferings of the Episcopal Clergy, p. 132

⁴⁵Ibid., The Case of the Afflicted Clergy Examined, p. 99

for 1689 shows that a serious attempt was made to administer justice in terms of the charges brought against the Episcopal ministers, and that where there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the charge it was allowed to fall. Of the 200 cases which came before the Council, Crawford tells Melville, in a letter dated 24th October, 1689, that he deserted the summons in no fewer than thirty-three cases.⁴⁶

Ministers were not deprived because they were for Episcopacy as against Presbytery. They were deprived because their Jacobitism found its expression in their Episcopacy. An Episcopacy which had been prepared to read the Proclamation and pray for the new King and Queen would have survived the Revolution in Scotland as it did in England. In the Session Records for Dingwall,⁴⁷ dated December 8th 1689, it is recorded that there had been no sermon since October because the minister, Mr. John Macrae had been summoned before the Council for not reading the Proclamation deposing King James and establishing William and Mary; but his case was dismissed for lack of evidence and he returned to preach from his pulpit in Dingwall. Mr. Macrae, however, did not escape for long. In June 1690 he was "taken out of his house and kept close prisoner in Brahan Castle, by order of the Governor of Inverness, 'lest he communicate and give intelligence to the Marquis of Seaforth, who hath landed on 20th May with some officers from Ireland'".

⁴⁶Leven and Melville Papers: Crawford's Letter to Melville dated 24th October, 1689, p. 425.

⁴⁷Macrae, Romance of a Royal Burgh, p. 300.

John Ross,⁴⁸ of Dornoch, was summoned before the Privy Council on 7th November 1689, for not reading the Proclamation of the Estates, and not praying in terms thereof. He was able to show, however, that the Proclamation had not been sent to the Sheriff depute for Sutherland, and made a declaration that "he had no scruple to read it", and that he had prayed for William and Mary. His defence was accepted and he was acquitted. This judgment gives little indication of his true convictions, for we find that he demitted his charge in 1691.

William Falconer,⁴⁹ of Dyke, later non Jurant Bishop of Moray, offered as his defence that he had not read the Proclamation because Viscount Dundee was in the vicinity with a force of armed men. It was pointed out to him that all during the time when Major General McKay was in the neighbourhood the Proclamation had still remained unread. His defence was not accepted. He was deprived.

John Paik,⁵⁰ of Carriden, had had his life threatened for giving information to the authorities against Donald Cargill and other preachers. For his good services the Privy Council in 1680 had recommended him to the Lords of the Treasury for some suitable financial reward. Now he found himself before the Council for not reading the Proclamation and not praying for William and Mary. The charge failed for lack of evidence, and he was acquitted.

⁴⁸Fasti, VII, 84. Part V, p. 84 (1871 Edition).

⁴⁹Ibid., VI, 416. Part V, p. 181 (1871 Edition).

⁵⁰Ibid., I, 198. Part I, p. 179 (1871 Edition).

He did not remain for long in possession of his parish. In 1690 he was deposed by the Presbytery on a charge of drunkenness.

LORD CRAWFORD'S LETTERS

No statesman of the time was more involved in the process of legal deprivation than the Earl of Crawford, President of the Council. In a series of letters to Lord Melville between July 1689 and January 1690 he sets down in plain terms the problems with which he had to deal as they related to the Episcopal incumbents.

On 4th July⁵¹ he wrote: "The conform preachers have everywhere debauched the people, and rendered them disaffected to the civil government; nor have one of six read the proclamation, or prayed for our King and Queen, nor observed the Thanksgiving; and yet these are not deprived, according to the tenour of that proclamation, nor are as much as cited, lest we displease the Commissioner. Yea, the most of the conformists have expressly prayed against our King, and for the late King, and have hounded out their people to rise in arms, and now do boast that whatever injury they had by the Meeting of Estates shall be repaired to them by Parliament It is evidence that the number of the King's friends is small in this nation, except those who are of the Presbyterian way, and that every one of these are unalterably for him."

Again, on 10th August,⁵² he wrote: "The bulk of the

⁵¹Leven and Melville Papers: Letter from Crawford to Melville, dated 4th July, 1689, p. 139.

⁵²Ibid., 10th August, 1689, p. 248.

conformists are everywhere praying for the late King; for though some of these may be more reserved in their way than others, all of them are of the same inclinations, and have dis-served our King's interest more than the army that hath been in the fields in opposition to us". He goes on to warn Melville: "It is vain to expect peace in this nation until the Presbyterian government be settled, and these disturbers of our quiet be laid waste, and such as countenance them be divested of power".

By Episcopalians such as John Sage no man was viewed as being more bigoted to the interests of Presbyterianism than Crawford. Even Burnet accepts this view for a time, and regards the actions of the Privy Council as a "frantic and furious breaking out against such of the Episcopal party as had escaped the range of the former year".⁵³ In general this appears to have been the view of Scottish affairs by English Churchmen. Melville wrote to Crawford in December, 1689, saying: "The Convocation here flies high: their pretence is the vigour used against these of their persuasion in Scotland, which they say, if not redressed, they will show less favour to the Nonconformists here".⁵⁴

Burnet, however, came to change his mind about the Episcopalians north of the Tweed. He admits later that it was impossible for William to have preserved Episcopacy in Scotland, "had he been ever so zealous for it". For "the Episcopal party went almost universally into King James's interests, so that the

⁵³Leven and Melville Papers, Preface, p. XXIX; Burnet, Own Times Vol. II, p. 95; Sage, An Account of the late Establishment of Presbyterian Government, p. 90.

⁵⁴Privy Council Register, 1689, Vol. 14. Introduction, p. XVII

Presbyterians were the only party that the King had in that kingdom".⁵⁵

He has some very hard things to say, too, about his fellow Episcopalians when he finds that they have played false over the conditions required for granting a toleration. He discovered that they never had any intention of engaging loyally in the King's interest, that their whole scheme had been "an artifice to disgust the Presbyterians".⁵⁶

Crawford was, again, severely criticized by the Episcopalians for his purging of the Universities, when his Commission⁵⁷ was accused of proceeding with "more zeal for Presbytery than regard for learning". Crawford himself presided over the Committee investigating St. Andrews and Edinburgh. Lord Carmichael went to Glasgow. Both Carmichael and Crawford deprived those members of the Universities staffs who refused to sign the Confession of Faith, or take the Oath of Allegiance and subscribe the Assurance. There is no doubt as to the academic competence of Drs. Skene, Munro and Fall, but because they stubbornly refused to take the Oaths to the new Sovereigns, they had to be deposed. To allow them to remain in the positions they occupied in the Universities of Scotland was to subject the King's interest to far too grave a risk.

Crawford was, of course, a convinced Presbyterian; from the

⁵⁵Leven and Melville Papers, Preface, p. XXIX; Burnet, History of Own Times, Vol. II, p. 24.

⁵⁶Burnet, History of Own Times, Vol. II, p. 74.

⁵⁷Sage, An Account of the late Establishment of Presbyterian Government. The Visitation of the Universities of St. Andrews, Edinburgh and Glasgow, p. 87-95.

Episcopal point of view a "bigoted" Presbyterian. Melville had sacrificed a great deal for the Presbyterian cause. Neither man could be said to be entirely impartial in these matters. Their Correspondence, however, reveals men who faced a situation in which the vital factors spoke for themselves irrespective of either Crawford's or Melville's personal inclinations. Their advice was that the only bulwark that could be raised in Scotland in defence of the King's interests was the speedy settlement of Presbytery and the deprivation of the representatives of Episcopacy.

On 12th October, 1689,⁵⁸ Crawford wrote to Melville in obvious rebuttal of English criticism of his handling of the Episcopal ministers in Scotland.

"None were deprived", he insists, "where there was express praying for our King and Queen, even though there had been a neglect in reading of that Proclamation, so peremptorily enjoined by the meeting of Estates, providing they had not contemptuously refused to read it, which some did, (who otherwise prayed for our King and Queen), as being unfree to approve the laying aside of King James. Where that Proclamation was really read, either by ministers or precentors, by their order and authority so far countenanced, we did not deprive such, tho' they had only prayed in indirect terms for the King and Queen, notwithstanding of the tenour of the Proclamation; that appoints them to be named and prayed for as our King and Queen."

He, then, comes to the crux of the matter: "But the truth is there were few before us but had transgressed in all respects". He returns again to the defence of what had been done by the Privy

⁵⁸Leven and Melville Papers, Letter from Crawford to Melville, dated 12th October, 1689, p. 301.

Council in a letter to Melville, dated 21st January, 1690,⁵⁹

"I shall once more repeat what I have oft said on this subject, that no Episcopal man since the happy Revolution, whether laick or of the clergy, hath suffered by the Council upon account of his opinions in Church matters, but allennearly for their disowning the civil authority, and setting up for a cross interest. If I make not this good. I shall willingly forfault my credit with his Majesty and all good men".

AN ESSENTIAL PART OF OUR RELIGION

The essential, firm and unshakeable loyalty which the Episcopalians showed towards the House of Stuart sprang from more than political considerations. While, no doubt, men did look for a political restoration of the Royal House, and were loyal to this political hope for more than half a century, the explanation of their "interminable and steadfast allegiance" does not lie here. It is to be found rather in their stubbornly held doctrine of Divinely ordered monarchy: in an order of Kingship that was as Divinely ordained as their own Episcopal order.

Early in 1688 Archbishop Ross, in his capacity as Chancellor

⁵⁹ Leven and Melville Papers. Letter from Crawford to Melville, dated 21st January, 1690, p. 305. Also letter dated 25th April, 1691 - "This Church division, in opposition to the legal establishment, will in this Nation be found to be a stated difference for King William and the late King. If it be found otherwise in the issue, let me be reckoned an imposter and the betrayer of our Kings interest.", p. 602.

of the University of St. Andrews, sent up a Loyal Address⁶⁰ to James II. This Address begins by paying tribute to the constant liberality of the Royal House both to Church and University. It then proceeds to expound what was the current view of the doctrine of monarchy.

God is the only source of power, not the people. In every regularly constituted society there must be a seat of absolute power. Hereditary monarchy is superior to every other form of government. More evil results are to be feared from democratic excesses than from the exercise of absolute monarchy. The absolute power of monarchy must never be resisted, and may be disobeyed only when it opposes Scripture.

When the Archbishop and his fellow Bishops heard that attempts were being made in England to dispossess James and bring over the Prince of Orange, they met together in Edinburgh, and sent up to the King a loyal and dutiful address, in which they reaffirmed their own loyalty, and expressed their dismay at hearing of the intended invasion from Holland.

They ended their address with these words: "As, by the grace of God, we shall preserve in ourselves a firm and unshakeable loyalty, so we shall be careful and zealous to promote in all your subjects an interminable and steadfast allegiance to your Majesty, as an essential part of our religion, and of the glory of

⁶⁰Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MSS. 985 C. No. 114. Address to the King by the University of St. Andrews; Lyon, History of St. Andrews, Vol. II, p. 106; Skinner, Ecclesiastical History, Vol. II, p. 512; Lyon, History of St. Andrews, Vol. II, p. 107.

our holy profession: not doubting but that God in his great mercy, who hath so often preserved and delivered your Majesty, will still preserve and deliver you by giving you the hearts of your subjects and the necks of your enemies". This address was signed by the twelve Bishops on 3rd November, 1688, at Edinburgh.

Events, however, fulfilled the fears of the Scottish Bishops, and Bishop Rose of Edinburgh found himself in a London from which James had fled, a London which had hailed the Prince of Orange as the Deliverer. Believing profoundly in the Divine right of monarchy, bound by oath to the King who had fled, faced with a set of circumstances about which he had received no instructions from his fellow Bishops before leaving Scotland, what was Rose to do?

At a meeting of the Scottish peers at Whitehall on 7th January, 1689, a proposal was made by the Earl of Arran that James should be asked to return and call a free Parliament. This proposal was rejected, but in his speech Arran expressed the dilemma in which the Bishops found themselves.⁶¹

"I cannot violate my duty to my master. I must distinguish between his Popery and his person: I dislike the one, but I have sworn and do owe allegiance to the other, which makes it impossible for me to sign away that which I cannot forbear believing is the King my masters right; for his present absence from us in France can no more affect my duty, than his longer absence from us (in England) has done all this while."

Archbishop Sancroft and his Non Juring colleagues were far

⁶¹Keith, Scottish Bishops, Appendix, p. 495.

too concerned with their own predicament to be able to advise their brother from Scotland.⁶² Gilbert Burnett gave him a cold reception, and stated that "he did not meddle in Scottish affairs". Francis Turner, Bishop of Ely, gave Rose all the help that he could, but the Bishops in England faced division among themselves over this very issue. Sancroft kept to his palace and refused to accept William. It is not to be wondered at that they had no wish to entangle themselves in Scottish problems.

William was now no longer the Prince of Orange, summoned from Holland to assist in calling a free Parliament. On 13th February, both Houses of the Convention Parliament had presented William and Mary with an Address declaring them King and Queen of England, France and Ireland.

Could Rose address the Prince under his new title? To do so would be a fatal compromise for his conscience and for his party. He made preparations, therefore, to return to Scotland, but found that to do so he required a pass from the King. He turned again to the Bishop of London for advice. Compton insists that he should see William before he departs.⁶³

Compton arranged for Rose to meet the King, and conveyed to Rose the gist of his own conversation with William on Scottish affairs, so that Rose was by no means ignorant of William's

⁶²Carpenter, The Protestant Bishop, p. 301.

⁶³Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, No. 1833. A full Account of Rose's visit to London is given in a letter from Rose to Mr. Archibald Campbell, at London, dated 23rd October, 1713; Keith, Scottish Bishops, p. 65-72.

appreciation of the present position of the Church parties in Scotland.

"You see my lord, the King having thrown himself upon the water, must keep himself a swimming with one hand. The Presbyterians have joined him closely and offer to support him, and therefore he cannot cast them off, unless he could see how otherwise he could be served. And he bids me tell you that he now knows the State of Scotland much better than he did when he was in Holland. For while there he was made to believe that Scotland generally all over was Presbyterian, but now he sees that the great body of the nobility and gentry are for Episcopacy and it is the trading and inferior sort that are for Presbytery. Wherefore he bids me tell you, that if you will undertake to serve him, to the purpose that he is served here in England, he will take you by the hand, support the Church and Order, and throw off the Presbyterians".

Whether this was a very accurate account of William's appreciation of the situation in Scotland we do not know. It may well be that Compton presented the King's views in as favourable a light as possible. He certainly makes the issue very clear to Rose. Perhaps, in hope that disaster for Episcopacy in Scotland might be averted, and a basis for comprehension between the two parties achieved on the ground of their common loyalty to William and Mary.

If this was Compton's intention it was an idle dream. Rose's answer was: "My Lord, I cannot but humbly thank the Prince for his frankness and offer; - but withal I must tell your Lordship, that when I came from Scotland, neither my brethren nor I apprehended

any such Revolution as I have now seen in England, and therefore I neither was, nor could be, instructed by them what answer to make to the Prince's offer; and therefore what I say is not in their name, but only my private opinion, which is that I truly think they will not serve the Prince so as he is served in England; that is (as I take it) to make him their King, or give their suffrage for his being King. And though as to this matter I can say nothing in their name, and as from them, yet for myself I must say, that rather than do so I will abandon all the interest that either I have, or may expect to have in Britain."

Compton, it appears, accepted this as a true statement of the view of the Scottish Bishops about the Revolution in England. He says, merely, that he believes this to be the case. "For all the time you have been here, neither have you waited on the King, nor have any of your brethren, the Scots bishops, made any address to him. So the King must be excused for standing by the Presbyterians". The next day the interview with the King arranged by Compton took place.

Again we follow Rose's narrative.

The King expressed the hope that he "would be kind" to him, "and follow the example of England". "Wherefore", Rose says, "being somewhat diffculted how to make a mannerly and discreet answer, without entangling myself, I readily replied - Sir, I will serve you as far as law, reason, or conscience allow me. How this answer pleased the Prince I cannot well tell; but it seems the limitations and conditions of it were not acceptable, for instantly the Prince, without saying anything more, turned away from me, and

went back to his company".

Canon Carpenter,⁶⁴ in his Life of Bishop Compton - "The Protestant Bishop" puts forward the view that it would have been better if Rose had never met the King in this fateful interview. Compton should have advised him to return to Scotland some weeks earlier and thus prevented this head on confrontation. But would such a move really have succeeded? Rose knew well the issues with which he had to deal. His answer whether given at once to the King or postponed until he had returned for consultations with his brethren in Scotland could have been no different. It sprang not from political considerations but from deep theological convictions. It would have been the same whether Rose had met William face to face or not.

This is borne out later in Rose's narrative when he records an interview he had with the Duke of Hamilton after his return to Scotland.⁶⁵ "After my coming down here, my Lord St. Andrews and I taking occasion to wait on Duke Hamilton, his Grace told us, a day or two before the sitting down of the Convention, that he had a special charge from King William that nothing should be done to the prejudice of Episcopacy in Scotland, in case the Bishops could by any means be brought to befriend his interest: and prayed us most pathetically, for our own sake, to follow the example of the Church of England. To which my Lord St. Andrews replied that, both by natural allegiance, the laws, and the most solemn oaths,

⁶⁴Carpenter, The Protestant Bishop, p. 305.

⁶⁵Keith, Scottish Bishops, p. 65

we were engaged in the King's interest; and that we were, by God's grace, to stand by it in the face of all dangers, and to the greatest losses". It was not too late for the Scottish bishops at this stage to have revoked Rose's answer given in London, if they had so desired. But Rose had not been mistaken, when he spoke for himself, he spoke for them all. With the answer which he had given they never made any compromise.

THE BISHOPS IN THEIR PRAYERS

On 14th March, 1689, the Estates met in Edinburgh.⁶⁶ The nine prelates of the Church were in their places. The Bishop of Edinburgh officiated as Chaplain, and made it one of his petitions, when he said prayers, that God would help and restore King James. The Convention rebuked him for this sentiment by passing a resolution that - "The Bishops in their prayers should not mention or insinuate anything against their acts or proceedings".

On 16th March letters from the Prince of Orange and King James were read. But before reading the King's letter it was moved that should James's letter contain a mandate that the Estates should be dissolved, notwithstanding such an order they should continue to sit, any such order they would regard as null and void, and they would remain assembled till they accomplished their work of securing the liberty and religion of Scotland.

Seven out of the nine bishops subscribed this motion.

When James's letter was read it showed that recent events had

⁶⁶Melville, Balfour, Proceedings of the Estates 1689-90 Scottish History Society, p. 14-26; History of the late Revolution in Scotland (1690), p. 92-100.

taught him very little. Its tone was insolent and obstinate. Traitors who returned to their allegiance would be spared, against all others vengeance and doom was pronounced. This letter did nothing to help James, and lost him a good deal of support.

Dundee now withdrew from Edinburgh and the City was left in the control of Hamilton and his armed men from Lanarkshire and Ayrshire.

None of these events brought about a change of mind on the part of the Bishops. When the Estates' letter of thanks was sent to William they unanimously refused to subscribe their names.

The Estates, then, proceeded to appoint a Committee to frame a plan of Government. Of the 24 members, 8 were peers, 8 were representatives of counties, and 8 were representatives of towns, not a single prelate was included.

In the issues which came up for debate, however, the Bishops were not silent. When the Convention passed a resolution appointing Major General Mackay as the Commander of their forces the Archbishop of Glasgow pleaded that the bishops might be excused from voting on this matter. No doubt he was unwilling that in any way they should be party to the usurpation of a power that they held belonged solely to the King. He offered the excuse that Divines had nothing to do with military arrangements.

"The Fathers of the Church", was the reply, " have been lately favoured with a new light. I have myself seen military orders signed by the Most Reverend person who has suddenly become so scrupulous. There was indeed one difference: these orders

were for dragooning Protestants: and the resolution before us is meant to protect us from Papists".

On April 4th, when the business of the day was over, one of the Bishops offered to say prayers, as the custom was. It was moved, however, that since King James was no more their King he would pray for him at his peril. It is recorded that the Bishop discreetly said only the Lord's Prayer.

In "A Vindication of the Proceedings of the Convention of the Estates in Scotland"⁶⁷ the advocacy of the cause of James by the Bishops is dealt with very critically.

They had urged the Convention with great vehemence: "That Monarchy is Jure Divine, and that Kings hold their Crowns immediately from God Almighty alone; and that it is by Him that Kings reign; that the higher powers are ordained by God, and are accountable only to him, and therefore cannot be divested of that right by the people". In the view of the writer of the "Vindication" nothing has contributed more to "enslave the Nation, and debauch men's consciences, than the preaching up of this doctrine of Absolute Power and Non Resistance". He challenges the "Promoters of this doctrine" to produce their Divine authority for it and thus "put an end to the controversy for all good men".

He asserts that this is a doctrine unknown to the first Reformers or to the generality of Protestant and even Popish writers. It can never "relish well with free born subjects", and

⁶⁷ A Collection of State Tracts During the reign of King William III, Vol. 3: A Speech by a Member of the Convention of States in Scotland, p. 437-439: A Vindication of the Proceedings of the Convention of Estates in Scotland, p. 441-465.

"has no other use than to incourage Kings to be Tyrants, and render them odious, and their people miserable".

He rejoices that the only Church in the world, the Church of England, which had preached up this doctrine has now begun to decry it, "and pluck it down as fast as ever they built it up".

He examines the Old Testament and New Testament evidence that was commonly used to support the claims of Absolute Monarchy and finds it wanting. He deals at great length with the history of Monarchy over a wide range of secular history. He ends this section of his "Vindication" by saying about Monarchy in the history of Scotland: "Fergus the First was not born a King, but made a King by the people". "Our monarchs are hereditary not by virtue of their birth but by reason of the Constitution". "If ever King James should be again set on the throne it must be by a Popish army".

THE NEW THEOLOGY

In his Ecclesiastical History,⁶⁸ John Skinner, the Episcopal historian, links together the position taken up by the Scottish bishops with that of the English Non Jurors. "Every defence", he says, "that the ejected succession in England could make for themselves, is applicable to the Scottish cause with equal propriety and force".

In 1689 and 1690 the pens of English Churchmen wrote innumerable

⁶⁸ Skinner, Ecclesiastical History, Vol. II, p. 580.

pamphlets and sermons about the Revolution issues⁶⁹ which confronted them, and the crisis of theological thought, conscience and personal decision it brought in its wake.

"Reasons", "Answers", "Reflections", "Speeches", "Letters", deal with the themes which divided English clerics into two uncompromising, opposed parties.

"The Divine right of Kings"; "the Original Contract between Prince and People"; "the Obligations of Kings to conform to their Oaths"; "the Right of forcible Resistance to the tyranny of Rulers"; "the Effect of an Abdication on the right of a legitimate Heir"; "the Right of the People to Depose the King"; "the True Nature of a Churchman of the Church of England" - these were the issues of the day.

For instance, in "A Speech to His Highness the Prince of Orange by a true Protestant of the Church of England as established by law", the writer approves entirely of the aims of the Prince of

⁶⁹Somers Tracts, Vol. I, p. 291, Some Reflections upon His Highness the Prince of Orange's Declaration; p. 303, An Answer to a Paper intituled Reflections on the Prince of Orange's Declaration; p. 400, Reasons Why the Rector of P took the Oath of Allegiance to William and Mary; p. 346, A Speech to His Highness the Prince of Orange by a true Protestant of the Church of England, as established by law; Vol. 2, p. 546, A Word to a Wavering Levite; Or an Answer to Dr. Sherlocks Reasons concerning the taking of Oaths; p. 553, The true Character of a Churchman, shewing the false pretences to that name; p. 577, Obedience due to the Present King, notwithstanding our Oaths to the former. Written by a Divine of the Church of England; P. 595, A Letter concerning Allegiance, written by the Lord Bishop of London, to a Clergyman in Essex, presently after the Revolution.

Orange, namely, to restore the Assembly of Estates to France, to relieve the French Protestants, to revive the Edict of Nantes, and to settle the peace of Europe, he is prepared to accept William as the Restorer of English liberties, and to secure the Protestant religion, but if he goes further than this, if he is either crowned himself, or allows his princess to be crowned, support for William is withdrawn. To do this would be to blemish their religion with the deposing doctrine, and would create such strong factions among the people of England that they would never be composed until the King was restored. Archbishop Sancroft, staunch Non Juror, reveals his mind on the crisis of conscience which the Revolution brought to him.⁷⁰ "As the laws of England stand", he wrote, "nothing can colour the exclusion of the present King, and the setting up of another, although we should suppose the whole people of England acting on it, unless we suppose also that they have an authority residing in them to judge, depose, and elect kings ad libitum". Such a liberty and right Sancroft and his fellow Bishops believed to be contrary to the known laws of God. How could he commit perjury, and take oaths to a usurper, believing that King James was the only lawful and Divinely ordered King of the Realm? This was the crux of the legal, political, theological, and ethical crisis in the midst of which he found himself as Archbishop, he could resolve it only in one way, by refusing to

⁷⁰D'Oyley, Life of Archbishop Sancroft, p. 417; Bodleian Library, Oxford, Tanner MSS, Vol. 459. The Present State of the English Government Considered, January, 1688.

take the Oaths to the new King, even if this step were to cost him his See.

This was the view of all his Non Juring colleagues,⁷¹ Bath and Wells, Ely, Gloucester, Norwich, Peterborough, Worcester, Chichester, and Chester. None of them were young men. Three were to die within a year. It was the fear of the saintly Bishop Ken,⁷² that they would be exposed to the world as "men of no conscience" for the stand they took. They were, on the contrary, men of the most sensitive and scrupulous conscience, and were fully prepared to suffer for it.

The Bishop of Gloucester⁷³ said on his death bed; "I think I could burn at the stake before I took this new oath". The Bishop of Chichester⁷⁴ made an almost identical declaration under similar circumstances. "If the oath had been tendered at the peril of my life", he said, "I could only have obeyed by suffering". The issues between the Non Jurors and the supporters of William can be summed up in Four Propositions.⁷⁵

(1) That the Power of Kings was originally Patriarchial,

⁷¹D'Oyley, Life of Archbishop Sancroft, p. 437

⁷²Life of Bishop Ken, by a Layman, Vol. II, 508-509; Scottish Bishops, Keith, p. 498

⁷³D'Oyley, Life of Archbishop Sancroft, p. 437

⁷⁴Life of Bishop Ken, Vol. II, p. 508.

⁷⁵Wagstaffe, Thomas, An Answer to a late Pamphlet: entitled Obedience and Submission to the Present Government, with a Postscript, p. 2. Four Propositions.

Derived from God and not from the People.

(2) That Descent in Hereditary Kingdoms is the ordinary way whereby a Right and Title to the Crown is claimed.

(3) That no violence is to be used to Kings from their own subjects for any irregularities they commit.

(4) That having sworn Allegiance to a Prince, we cannot without the dreadful guilt of perjury transfer our Allegiance, while he continues to have authoritative Right and Title to the Crown.

After the Restoration of the Monarchy these doctrines had become in England the theological bulwark against a return of Republicanism. These were the ideas current in English ecclesiastical thought when Sancroft and his fellow Non Juring Bishops were younger men. They were even accepted and supported by those who came to oppose these very conceptions with great vehemence at the Revolution, Tillotson, Burnet and Sherlock.

In a tract, "The Case of Resistance to the supreme powers stated and Resolved", written in the reign of Charles II, Sherlock had argued for the doctrine of passive obedience in its most extreme form. "Though kings should be merciless tyrants", he asserts, "they are above all law, and are accountable to God alone". Yet, from this extreme position Sherlock moved to support William. He brought out a new pamphlet to justify his change of mind, which he called, "The Case for Allegiance, stated and resolved according to Scripture and Reason, and the Principles of the Church of England".

Burnet, Sherlock and William Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph,⁷⁶ wrote pamphlets and preached sermons in which they advanced with consummate erudition the full weight of their argument in support of the new theology of Kingship. It was not an age in which one jot or tittle of an opponent's argument was left unanswered, and their writings deal very thoroughly with the points at issue:- the theological interpretation of the establishment of monarchy in the Old Testament; New Testament teaching on the same subject; the foundations of English Constitutional law and history as interpreted by such authorities as Fortescue and Coke; and the dangers to their own position inherent in the political philosophy of Mr. Hobbs.

A new theological understanding of Kingship had been hammered out, "All Sovereign Princes who are settled in their thrones are placed there by God",⁷⁷ writes Sherlock. "God sets

⁷⁶Burnet, An Enquiry into the present State of Affairs: Whether we owe Allegiance to the King in these Circumstances? Whether we are bound to treat with him, and call him back again or not? Sherlock, William, Their Present Majesties Government Proved to be Thoroughly Settled and that we may submit to it, without Asserting the Principles of Mr. Hobbs. Occasioned by some late Pamphlets against the Rev. Dr. Sherlock. The Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers Stated and Resolved according to Scripture and Reason and the Principles of the Church of England; Sherlock, William, A Vindication of the Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers in Reply to an Answer to a late Pamphlet; Lloyd, William, A Letter to Dr. Sherlock in Vindication of that part of Josephus's History which gives an Account of Iaddus the High Priest submitting to Alexander the Great while Darius was living. Against the Answer to the piece entitled Obedience and Submission to the Present Government; Taylor, Zachary, Obedience and Submission to the Present Government Demonstrated from Bishop Overalls Convocation Books.

⁷⁷Sherlock, Case of Allegiance, p. 10

up a King when by his Providence he advances him to the throne. He removes a king when by his Providence he thrusts him from his throne, and takes the Government out of his hands. For Providence is God's Government of the world, whereby he directs, determines or over-rules all events to the accomplishment of his own Will and Counsels."⁷⁸

Against those who would argue that they are bound in conscience to adhere to a King, who though out of possession, by the laws of the land has a legal right to the Crown, against the King who is actually settled in the Throne, de facto, by the Providence of God, Sherlock contends that such a position opposes the Providence of God against the Providence of God, his former Providence against his later Providence. "They will not allow", he says, "the Providence of God to change and alter, whatever reasons the Divine Wisdom sees for it. What God has once done, that they are resolved to abide by, whatever he thinks fit to do afterwards". This, he says, is "to shackle and confine Providence, that it shall not alter its usual methods in the Government of the world; so when it has disposed of the Crown once, shall never be at liberty, while that family lasts, to dispose of it again to any other."⁷⁹

On the subject of Non Resistance, Sherlock draws a clear distinction between fighting against a king and not fighting for him, and between driving a king away and allowing him to escape

⁷⁸Sherlock, Case of Allegiance, p. 12.

⁷⁹Ibid., Vindication of the Case of Allegiance, p. 44-45

quietly out of his kingdom. "When Kings make it impossible for their subjects to fight for them without fighting against the Religion and Liberties of their Country, then subjects are not bound to assist their Prince".⁸⁰

Francis Fullwood, in "Obedience due to the Present King notwithstanding our Oaths to the Former",⁸¹ presents his argument in terms of the King separating his Person from and engaging it against his Crown and Dignity in such a way that the subjects cannot defend both.

In such circumstances how are Oaths to the King to be kept? Fullwood asserts: "We are not bound to assist the Person of the King to the prejudice of his Crown and People".

On the subject of Oaths, Burnet has this to say: "The end and design of these Oaths was to secure us against the danger of Popery, as any one may see in the Acts by which they were imposed: And tho' all those Oaths are still to the King; yet that is to a Prince who subsists upon Law, and rules by Law; and therefore if the King ceases to be King, by subverting our Constitution first, and deserting us next, then all our Oaths fall to the ground; as the Matrimonial Oath tho' made for term of life, yet is capable of being dissolved when that which is the essence of the bond is broke".⁸²

To this new Whig theology the Non Jurors remained impervious,

⁸⁰ Sherlock, Case of Allegiance, p. 49-50

⁸¹ Fullwood, Obedience due to the present King, p. 9.2.

⁸² Burnet, An Enquiry into the Present State of Affairs, p. 9

as they appeared also to be blind to the political consequences of their ideology. For the sake of their Belief, for the sake of their Oath, they were willing to risk the destruction of their Church, whose security required a Protestant Succession limited by Law. They were ready to pledge their loyalty to a King whose first allegiance as a Roman Catholic was to Rome.

Was James more than Head of the State by Divine Right? Was he also Head of the Church by Divine Right? To depose the King meant the loss to their nation of Godly rule. Did it also involve doing irreparable damage to the Divine Society? Was the King part of the essential ordering by God of His Church?

Was this the secret, hidden dread of Jacobite theology in its defence of James by Divine Right?

NO KING, NO BISHOP

In 1690, there appeared "A Jacobite Form of Prayer and Humiliation,"⁸³ It breathed the spirit of extreme theological Jacobitism. It was alleged that it was written by Sancroft, but this is most unlikely, and was most strenuously denied in the "Vindication" which he and the Non Juring Bishops immediately issued. It did, however, give utterance to a violent, passionate Jacobite position which linked very closely the King as head by Divine Right of both Church and State.

James⁸⁴ is referred to as the stone which foolish builders

⁸³Macaulay, History of England, Vol. 5, p. 291-292; Lathbury, History of Non Jurors, p. 60

⁸⁴Form of Prayer and Humiliation, p. 60

have rejected, and fervent prayers are offered that God will make him once again the head of the corner. The Church of England⁸⁵ is seen as a ruined vineyard; the bread and wine she dispenses have no longer any sacramental value; her priests by swearing fealty to a Usurper have lost the sacred character conferred upon them by their ordination.

There is little doubt that the writers of this pamphlet hoped for an armed revolt supported by French troops, and if necessary the assassination of William. Its prayers are to this end, and they are militant and ferocious. However, for our present purpose we quote this key petition; "Restore unto us again the publick worship of Thy name, the reverent administration of Thy sacraments. Raise up the former Government both in Church and State, that we be no longer without King, without priest, without God in the world".⁸⁶

What are the clear implications of this petition? Is it not that if there is no King, there is no Bishop. If there is no King, there is no Church. At least this appears to have been the contemporary view of this theology. For, in a pamphlet, "Reflections upon a Form of Prayer lately set forth for Jacobites of the Church of England", the writer says - "If therefore that Head of the Church, which they suppose that God has assigned in these our days, be gone; according to that notion, we may be thought to be as without God in the world, shut out of the pale of

⁸⁵Form of Prayer and Humiliation, p. 56.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 39.

the Church, and left abroad among publicans and other sinners."⁸⁷

The subsequent history of the Non Jurors in England refutes completely of course this extreme Jacobite theology of 1690. There developed among the English Non Jurors a high doctrine of the Church, claiming a complete independence from the State in things spiritual, and asserting vigorously the intrinsic powers conveyed to the Church by Christ. Very soon the English Non Jurors ceased to have any effective links with the King across the water.

This can hardly be claimed, however, for the Stuart Bishops in Scotland. It is some thirty years before the theological insights of the English Non Jurors cross into Scotland. Then largely due to the influence of Bishops Campbell and Gadderar,

In "Some Reflections upon His Highness the Prince of Oranges Declaration"⁸⁸ there is evidence of this high absolute conception of the King's rights by Divine appointment over the Church. The author says about the Episcopalians in Scotland: "The King is head of their Church". They preach - "An indispensable conformity and obedience to the King's commands as God's vice regent".

Bishop Rose, for instance, gave practical expression to this high doctrine of the King's rights over the Church by making it a

⁸⁷Reflections, p. 10, (Reflections upon a Form of Prayer lately set forth for Jacobites of the Church of England, 1690.)

⁸⁸Somers Tracts, Vol. I, p. 291. Some Reflections upon his Highness the Prince of Oranges Declaration, para. 14.

condition of ordination, even after 1689, that candidates took the Oath to the exiled King. This proved to be a cause of considerable embarrassment to Scottish Episcopal ministers electing to leave Scotland to seek an appointment in England at the hands of one of the English Bishops. Rose insisted in describing the clergyman concerned, in his Letter of Commendation, as being "a faithful subject of King James 7th".⁸⁹

It was James I who produced the maxim: "No Bishop, no King". A developed Jacobite theology appears, however, to have reversed the theological premise of that dictum to read, "No King, no Bishop". It is significant that no one from the Episcopal Party in Scotland rose up to vindicate the new theology of the Anglican divines. Burnet, Sherlock and Lloyd have no counterparts in Scottish Episcopalianism.

The Scottish Episcopalians stood against more than the political consequences of the Revolution; they stood as firmly and determinedly against the theological changes which the Revolution brought with it.

The Revolution could have produced in Scotland an exceedingly maleable ecclesiastical situation. At this point in history it might be said that the ecclesiastical future of Scotland was in the melting pot.

⁸⁹Wake MSS. Christ Church Library, Oxford. Petition of Mr. Barclay to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln.

There might have emerged from this situation a unique ecclesiastical polity which would have fulfilled Leighton's dreams of Comprehension. Episcopacy of 1689 might have come to terms with Presbytery of 1689 but for one decisive factor, the Jacobitism of the Episcopalians.

By reason of Jacobitism this chance was lost. It has never come again.

CHAPTER 2

WILLIAM THE DELIVERER

In this chapter William's ecclesiastical policies and their reception in Scotland are considered. By conviction William was not either a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian. He would have been willing to accept an establishment in Scotland of either polity. The deciding factor was to be loyalty to his dynasty.

He made every effort to persuade the new Establishment to assume former Episcopal incumbents to a place in its Courts. He largely failed in his plans, not because of the reluctance of the Presbyterians to carry out his wishes, but because the Episcopalians continued in their refusal to have him as King, and placed themselves unambiguously for the Jacobite interest.

Not a Persecutor

William's Remarques

Hints to the King

Drunkenness

A First and Second Vindication

The King Defied

Some Seafield Letters

Planting the North

NOT A PERSECUTOR

The Proclamation of William and Mary in Edinburgh as the new Sovereigns left one important issue unresolved. The legal government of the Church was still Episcopal. How was Episcopacy to be abolished? Was this issue to be settled with or without William's help?

William already stood in a certain relationship to the Church of England. It would have been difficult for him to "declare himself hostile to a fundamental part of the constitution of that Church".¹ To offer the throne to William with this issue unsettled was to incur a grave risk. The Convention,² therefore, took the vital step. During the interregnum, when the supreme power lay with the Estates, there was inserted in the Claim of Right a declaration that prelacy was an insupportable burden to the Kingdom of Scotland. In this way a decision was taken for which William could never be held responsible, either by his opponents in Scotland or by his supporters in England.

William, nevertheless, faced an ecclesiastically divided Scotland. The old establishment North of the Tay remained virtually intact. The new Presbyterian establishment, while admittedly strong in the Lowlands, could not be said to represent more than the religious sentiments and political loyalties of that part of Scotland.

¹Macaulay, History of England, Vol. 4, p. 299.

²Leven and Melville Papers, Letter from Dalrymple to Melville, 5th April, 1689. State Papers, Scotland; Register House, Edinburgh, 57/14, p. 187. Lord Melville's Letter at the Kings Command to the Presbyterian Ministers.

The fate of both Parties depended on William's ecclesiastical policy for Scotland. Vital issues would be decided by the policies which he chose to pursue.

Was he, for instance, so much a Presbyterian by conviction that, in pursual of such convictions, he would eradicate Episcopacy throughout the whole of Scotland? No doubt the extreme Presbyterian party would have wished him to do this. Their hatred of Episcopacy and all its tenets was bitter and absolute. On the other hand, was it possible for him to support both Parties: to maintain in Scotland what might be called "two establishments" - one North of the Tay, which would be Episcopalian, one South of the Tay, which would be Presbyterian; both Parties remaining loyal to his dynasty, the real division between them being one of ecclesiastical polity?

If such a scheme proved unacceptable to him, or was considered by him to be completely unrealistic, he could attempt a third solution to his problem. He could try to bring both Parties within the one legal establishment of the Church on the common ground of loyalty to his dynasty.

He chose to attempt a policy of comprehension and unification within the one Establishment. He pursued this policy with great determination and scrupulous impartiality. He failed. The question must, therefore, be asked - Why? Did he fail because of Presbyterian intransigence - their high doctrine of Presbytery and General Assembly by Divine Right, their bitter, vindictive hatred of all things Episcopal? Or, given a certain amount of

coldness on the part of the Presbyterians towards the Episcopalians, was the decisive factor in the situation to be the Jacobitism of the Episcopalians, their refusal to have him as King?

On 11th May, 1689, the throne of Scotland was offered to William at Westminster.³ The sword of State was borne by a Scottish lord, and the Oath was put after the Scottish form. The last clause in the Oath contained a promise that the Sovereign would root out all heretics and all enemies of the true worship of God. If this promise was to be interpreted according to Presbyterian definition it would mean that William would become the persecutor of Roman Catholics, Episcopalians and extreme Covenanting Presbyterians. This he was unwilling to do. He would not take the Oath without more careful definition - "I will not," he said, "lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor".

The reply was promptly given: "Neither the words of the Oath, nor the laws of Scotland, lay any such obligation upon your Majesty". "In that sense, then, I swear", said William, "and I desire you all, my lords and gentlemen, to witness that I do so".

If the Presbyterian Party had hoped to present the throne to William on their terms, they had failed. If they had hoped that he would accept the offer without any careful definition of his position in matters ecclesiastical, they were disappointed.

³History of late Rebellion in Scotland: London Gazette,
May 16th, 1689.

From the very start he laid down the principle which was to govern his thinking and action in Scottish Church affairs. From it he never deviated. He was not in the pocket of the Presbyterian ecclesiastics, and he was not committed to a persecution of Episcopacy for its own sake.

"He was entirely without religious prejudices", says Winston Churchill, "no agnostic could have displayed more philosophic impartiality".⁴

WILLIAM'S REMARKS

William had never been to Scotland, and never came to Scotland. Much depended throughout his entire reign on the advice he received on Scottish affairs. He was surrounded by men who were prepared to offer him that advice. Some for the advancement of their own political and family fortune, some in the interests of their own Church Party; some were masters of political strategy; some were fanatical, bumbling incompetents, and some hoped for his destruction behind a facade of smooth words.

It is evident, however, that William had a mind of his own on Scottish ecclesiastical affairs. The clearest indication of his own view on Scottish Church matters is given in, "The King's Remarques upon an Act for Settling Church Government in 1690".⁵ These Remarques were made on a draft of this Act, sent to him for

⁴Churchill, W.S., History of English Speaking Peoples, Vol. III, p. 3.

⁵Leven and Melville Papers, p. 436

his consideration on 22nd May, 1690, by his Commissioner to the Estates.

In the draft Act the claim was made that the Reformation had been carried out without Prelacy. While William thought that as a matter of fact this was true, he also thought that the office of the Superintendent was so akin to the office of Bishop as to make this statement one of potential dispute and danger. It could have been interpreted, if he had approved of it, as a declaration of his prejudice against Episcopacy. Such an imputation he was unwilling to risk. "It were better", he says, "it were otherwise expressed". Again, in dealing with the thorny matter of the Government of the Established Church, he makes it plain that he does not wish it to be said that the King ratifies the Presbyterian Government of the Church in Scotland. He was neither Presbyterian nor Episcopalian; so he writes - His Majesty desires it to be expressed thus - "to be the government of the Church in this Kingdom established by law". This only placed William constitutionally on the side of the Presbyterians because constitutionally they had placed themselves on his side.

The draft Act attempted to exclude from the government of the Church all those who were not "sound Presbyterians". In his third remarque, therefore, William states that he considers this to be much too vague a phrase, which depended for its application too much on the "opinions of Particular men". He took the view that some of the reasons given him in setting forth the necessity for such a rule should be written into the Act itself. He is obviously afraid that an undefined power in the hands of the

Presbyterians would be used against those Episcopalians who might be persuaded, under Royal protection, to come into the Church as established by law and be admitted to a due share in its government. The precise terms of the admission of such men, he thinks, should be included in a Declaration and should be used as a Test.

Those essential requirements in William's view, were - Subscription to the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms; willingness to submit to the government of the Church as established by law; and good character - by which he meant, men who were "sober in their lives, sound in their doctrine, and qualified with gifts for the ministry". Would Presbyterians admit such men under these terms? Would Episcopalians seek to be admitted? These issues were still to be tested, but William had made his position plain.

In his fifth remarque William deals with the rights of meeting of the Synods and General Assemblies of the Church. Here William reveals his firmly held Erastian view of Church Establishment. The Courts of the Church should meet he says, at stated times, and "as often as shall be judged necessary, provided always, that they apply to him or his Privy Council to know if there be any inconveniency as to public affairs in their meetings at such times, and have his allowance accordingly". He insisted, also, that at all General Assemblies a Commissioner in the name of the King be present for the following purposes:- firstly, to ensure that the Church only debates matters which relate to its own affairs; secondly, to prevent them debating

matters which relate to the civil government, and to stop any such debate until a report has been made to the Privy Council and their direction in the matter given.

This view of the relationship of the Crown to the Assembly was to become a subject of bitter dispute between the King and his Presbyterian supporters in Scotland. At this time, however, had they but seen it, it provided the Church with a bulwark of immense strength against her constitutional enemies.

William again reveals his Erastian view of church establishment in his first Letter to the General Assembly in October 1690.⁶ He reminds the Assembly that Parliament had decided what the Government of the Church should be. Presbyterianism had not been established by the vote of the Church. It is, obviously, William's intention that the Crown shall decide about its own relationship to the General Assembly.

"Our concern for the good of our ancient kingdom, hath been such, that we have left nothing undone, that might contribute to the making of it happy: And therefore having been informed that differences as to the Government of the Church have caused great confusions in that Nation; we did willingly concur with our Parliament, in in-acting such a frame of it as was judged to be most agreeable to the inclinations of our good subjects". The Letter, then, indicates what the King expects of the Assembly, and lays down very firmly his policy of moderation.

⁶Acts of Assembly, 1690. His Majesty's Gracious Letter to the Assembly. 17th October, 1690.



"We could never be of the mind that violence was suited to the advancing of true religion: nor do we intend, that our Authority shall ever be a tool, to the irregular passions of any Party. Moderation is what religion enjoyns; neighbouring Churches expect from you, and we recommend to you. And we assure you of our constant favour and protection, in your following of these methods, which shall be for the real advantage of true Piety, and the peace of our Kingdoms".

The Assembly could have been in no doubt as to the King's policy of comprehension for Scotland: comprehension within the one legal establishment if possible, if not, then, the same indulgence for Episcopal ministers in Scotland as the Dissenters enjoyed in England, provided that "they lived peaceably under the Government, and took the Oath of Allegiance"⁷ but comprehension within the one legal establishment first. While the Assembly⁷ took care to remind the King that they had suffered "violence for conscience sake", and made reference, in their Reply to the King's Letter, to the grievous abuses of authority under which they had smarted during the late King's reign, they also reminded the King that great Revolutions brought with them great upheavals, and that complaints were often made for wrongs suffered which had in fact been justly deserved. No doubt many such complaints had reached the King. The Assembly assured him, however, that they are "not apprehensive of any impressions which evil reports can make", that they would study

⁷Acts of Assembly, 1690. The Assembly's Answer to the King's Letter.

"that moderation, which your Majesty recommends, as being convinced, that it is the duty that Religion enjoyns, and neighbouring Churches do most justly expect from us".

Next month the Assembly began to implement the King's policy. "Instructions for Visitations on the South and North sides of Tay" were issued⁸ in which were laid down the terms upon which Episcopal ministers could be assumed into ministerial communion. "None shall be removed from their places," they said, "but such as are either insufficient, or scandalous, or erroneous, or supinely negligent: And that those of them be admitted to ministerial communion with us, who upon due trial, and in a competent time for that trial, shall be found orthodox in doctrine, of competent abilities, of a godly, peaceable, and loyal conversation".

The Assembly further warned the Commissions appointed to carry out these instructions that "they were to be very cautious in receiving information against the late conformists" and ordered them "to proceed in the matter of censure very deliberately, so as none may have just cause to complain of their rigiditie".

HINTS TO THE KING

It may well be argued that this move of the Assembly was merely a formal acceptance of the King's wishes. In reality

⁸Acts of Assembly, 1690, Instructions to the Commissions for Visitations on the South and North sides of Tay. 13th November, 1690.

they did little to carry out the King's policies. Indeed, was it not a misjudgment on the King's part to expect them to tackle his schemes for comprehension with other than lukewarm enthusiasm?

If Carstares' views, which are recorded by McCormick in "Hints to the King"⁹ represent a sound judgment on the Episcopal Party in Scotland in their relationship to William and there is nothing in the history of the following years which indicates that they do not, surely the King must have realized that Scottish Episcopalianism might well present him with a problem that could prove to be intractable. It was Carstares' view -

1. That the Episcopal Party in Scotland was generally disaffected to the Revolution, and are enemies to the principles upon which it was conducted: whereas, the Presbyterians had almost to a man declared for it, and were, moreover, the great body of the nation; none, therefore, would think it strange, that the friends of a Government should enjoy all the encouragement it can afford, whilst it withheld its countenance from open and avowed enemies.

2. That the Episcopal clergy in Scotland, particularly the prelates, had been so accustomed to warp their religious tenets with political doctrines of royal supremacy, passive obedience, and non resistance, that it became inconsistent with the very end of his coming, to continue Episcopacy upon its present footing in Scotland.

Whether this "First Conversation with the King" is a romantic

⁹Carstares State Papers, Life of Carstares, Joseph McCormick p. 38-40.

reconstruction of history similar to McCormick's account of the dramatic intervention by Carstares at Kensington Palace in 1693 is a matter for conjecture. There appears to be no documentary evidence to support "Hints to the King". But there can be little doubt that the views attributed to Carstares in this first conversation with the King are those to which he subsequently adhered. In a long "Account of Prelacy and Presbytery in Scotland from 1560 to present times"¹⁰, written for Mr. Harley during Anne's reign, he records views very similar to those expressed in "Hints to the King". He judged that all Episcopalians were "Jacobites at heart": "And though they would court her Majesty's favour as if they were of the same persuasion as her in Church matters yet none can doubt with us from what they have seen and daily see that their real affection is to promote the Jacobite interest".

However, at this period it is doubtful if Carstares' views about Scottish affairs differed very radically from the advice being given to the King by Stair. He had a surer grasp of the subtleties of principle which motivated the different groups within the Presbyterian Party than he had: but they were both concerned chiefly with the establishment of William's Government

¹⁰ Edinburgh University Library, MSS. Carstares Letters, D.K. I.12, p. 228. A Copy of a Letter written to Mr. Harley. A Comparative view of Presbytery and Prelacy in Scotland from 1560 to present times.

upon a sound and durable basis. This object they had to achieve as soon as possible both in the King's interest and in their own. As it turned out Presbyterianism was the one ecclesiastical support for the King about which they could be certain, but with the principles and prejudices of extreme Covenanting Presbyterians they had little sympathy. They were moderate in their Presbyterianism, and if the Episcopalians had been similarly moderate they would have been willing to accept a comprehension of Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism within the one legal ecclesiastical establishment.

No doubt Carstares did offer the King the soundest advice on Scottish ecclesiastical affairs. For example, McCormick records that Carstares warned the King against - "Giving the smallest suspicion to any one of the contending parties, whether in Church or State, that he was so far engrossed or monopolized by the other, as to adopt those private animosities or resentments with which they were inflamed against each other".

Sound as this advice undoubtedly was, there is no reason to believe that this was not already William's own mind on the subject.

If we can accept McCormick's account of Carstares' advice to the King at the beginning of his reign, it is of considerable interest that on the question of the repeal of Patronage Carstares placed himself against popular Presbyterian principle and advised the King that Patronage¹¹ should be kept. He did

¹¹Carstares State Papers. Life of Carstares. Joseph McCormick, p. 48.

so, McCormick says, because he believed that to retain it in no way compromised the essential principles of Presbyterian Government; and that if it were not repealed such an action would result in too much power, without adequate safeguards, being placed in the hands of the restored Presbyterian ministers. This is an indication of the distrust with which Carstares viewed his fellow Churchmen of narrower principle in the North. It is also a warning to the King of the potential damage that such men in possession of unrestrained power could do to his interest.

Over this issue it might have been wiser for the King to have accepted Carstares' advice. Perhaps, now would have been the best time to force a crisis with the brash, heady Presbyterianism of the new Establishment in Scotland. As it was the Presbyterians were given sufficient time to taste power, and run their own affairs with small regard for the King's wishes. Not only did they do little to advance William's plans, by their passive resistance to his demands they successfully frustrated them. They appear also to have been singularly unaware of the Erastian nature of their Establishment. They allowed themselves to be carried away with high flying ideas of Presbytery by Divine Right: views which William by no means shared. Sooner or later this vital question of their relationship to the Crown had to be resolved. It might have been more beneficial to the true interests of both the Church and the King if this crisis had come in 1690 rather than in 1693.

DRUNKENNESS

In the record of events in Parish and Presbytery at this time it is difficult to distinguish between the Presbyterian's fear of Jacobitism and its consequences, and their narrow and vengeful view of all former Episcopalians. This, indeed, may be to make a false and unrealistic distinction, one which was never attempted at the time. There is, however, the strongest evidence that former Episcopalians whom the Privy Council had either failed to deprive, or had made no attempt to deprive, were deposed by Presbyteries on a variety of ecclesiastical charges, into which the delicate question of their loyalty to King William and Queen Mary did not appear to enter.

In his letter to the General Assembly of 1690 William had made plain his attitude towards the former Episcopal clergy. In his Additional Instructions to his Commissioner, Lord Carmichael,¹² he emphasised again his policy in very precise terms. "You are to take care", he says, "that there is no procedure against any incumbent upon that ground that they have served under Episcopacy". However, the records show that in 1690 a remarkable number of clergy who had served under Episcopacy, and who still were in possession of their parishes began to be deposed by their Presbyteries on charges of a purely ecclesiastical nature.

John Pairk,¹³ of Carriden, although acquitted by the Privy Council on 10th September, 1689, was deposed by the Presbytery of

¹²Register House MSS. State Papers. Scotland. Warrant Books, Treasury Miscellany. T 56/24, p. 4, No. 4(7). Additional Instructions to Lord Carmichael.

¹³Fasti, I, 198.

Linlithgow on 28th August, 1690, on a charge of drunkenness. Andrew Bruce,¹⁴ of Pittenweem, had been acquitted by the Privy Council in 1689, but he was deposed by the Presbytery in 1692 on a charge of drunkenness. George Purves,¹⁵ of Glencorse, although rabbled in 1689, had enjoyed the protection of the Committee of Estates, but in 1690 the Presbytery of Dalkeith took action against him and deposed him for drunkenness. He objected to some of the witnesses who gave evidence against him, alleging that some of them were prejudiced against him, bore him malice, and had previously assaulted him in his pulpit with swords and staves. His plea was not accepted. John Macmath,¹⁶ of Lasswade, in the same Presbytery, had also enjoyed the protection of the Estates in 1689; on 10th August, 1690, however, the Presbytery took action against him. Although certificates of good conduct and character were produced in his favour by Sir Will. Drummond of Hawthornden, eight other heritors, eleven elders and nine heads of families, after 20 years as their minister he was deposed for drunkenness. In 1690, the Presbytery of Peebles,¹⁷ deposed the ministers of Newlands and Traquair for drunkenness, and the minister of Eddleston for "charming" - private baptism. The Presbytery of Biggar¹⁸ deposed the minister of Broughton for "charming", and the minister of Kilbucko for

¹⁴Fasti, 5, p. 226.

¹⁵Ibid., I, 321. Part IV, p. 281 (1871 Edition)

¹⁶Ibid., I, 329. Part IV, p. 290 (1871 Edition)

¹⁷Ibid., I, 284 and 293.

¹⁸Ibid., I, 241 and 244. The Minister of Kilbucko had been acquitted by the Privy Council for not praying for William and Mary.

declining their authority.

Throughout the majority of the Presbyteries South of the Tay this work of deposing former Episcopal ministers went merrily on. Charges of drunkenness disposed of the ministers of Oldhamstocks,¹⁹ Fenwick, Drymen, Luss,²⁰ Stichell, Lochrutton, Carsphairn, and Forteviot; William Crawford at Ladykirk,²¹ a man over eighty years of age, was deposed on a charge arising out of an instance of drunkenness which had occurred some 15-16 years before. Charges of contumacy disposed of the ministers of Balfron, St. Boswells, Kilspindie, and Burntisland. James Craig, of Killearn,²² although acquitted by the Privy Council in 1689, was deposed on 13th August, 1690, by the Presbytery of Dunbarton for "profanation of the Lords Day, promiscuous invitation to the Lord's Supper and neglect of family worship." Several charges, of course, could be combined. William Anderson, of Luss,²³ had in addition to the charge of drunkenness to face charges of - "Swearing, Sabbath breaking, connivance at sacrilege, and negligence in his calling". From such a powerful array of charges he could have had no hope of acquittal by the Presbytery. Against conviction of ecclesiastical offences of this kind there was little chance of a successful appeal. Drunkenness was obviously not a very difficult charge to prove against ministers in

¹⁹Fasti, I, 412.

²⁰Ibid., III, p. 95, 339, 357.

²¹Ibid., II, 92, 291, 401; VI, 211; II, 54.

²²Ibid., III, 329; II, 191; VI, 214; V, 82; III, 349.

²³Ibid., III, 359.

late 17th Century Scotland. (One wonders how Alexander Webster,²⁴ of the Tolbooth, would have fared had his Presbytery had the mind to prefer a charge of this kind against him.)

If, however, in addition to the ecclesiastical charge of "contumacy" or "charming" or "drunkenness" there could also be included incidents which cast considerable doubt about the loyalty of the minister appearing at the bar of the Presbytery, the opportunity was not lost to make the most of his disaffection to the new Royal House, and his lingering loyalties towards the old. A case of this kind is fully documented in, "An Account of the Purging and Planting of the Congregation of Dalkeith",²⁵ 1691, a pamphlet which deals with the deposition, trials and appeals of Mr. Alexander Heriot, of Dalkeith, the former Episcopal incumbent of the Parish.

Mr. Heriot was deposed by the Presbytery for having declined its "pretended Judicatory and Jurisdiction". He appealed against this decision to the Synod and to the General Assembly, and, thereafter, to the Privy Council. His appeal to the Privy Council was heard on 17th March, 1691. It was dismissed, and the sentences of Presbytery, Synod and General Assembly were upheld.

Part of the interest of Mr. Heriot's case is that he was able to carry it through the Church Courts to the Privy Council. However, since he had been properly charged with ecclesiastical offences, as they were then understood, unless the Church Courts

²⁴Blaikie, W.G., Preachers of Scotland; 260; Chambers, Traditions of Edinburgh, p. 213; Lees, J. Cameron, St. Giles Edinburgh, p. 257

²⁵An Account of the Purging and Planting of the Congregation of Dalkeith. (1691), p. 10-12.

had failed to conduct the prosecution against him correctly, he had little hope that the Privy Council would overturn the legal decisions of the Church Courts. Mr. Heriot had been charged, of course, with ecclesiastical offences - "Having admitted to the Lord's Table scandalous persons and such as were notourly prophane in their lives, as habitual drunkards, swearers and the like"; and with "negligence of discipline in the case of gross scandals, in that he had allowed Thomas Findlaw and Janet Somervell to live together as man and wife, notwithstanding it was notourly known that the said Janet's first husband was alive". In addition he was charged with acts which openly displayed his Jacobite sentiments. It was alleged that he had drunk King James's health at a bonfire on 14th October, 1688; that he had rejoiced and shown evidence of cheerfulness at the news of the defeat of the King's Army at Killiecrankie; that in his seeming observance of the late Public Thanksgiving for the Preservation of their Majesties Persons and Government, the defeat of the Irish Army, and the discovery of the late plot, "he made no mention of any of them either in praying or preaching, whereby there was plain dissembling with God and Man"; that he had persecuted those of his parishioners who had gone to Presbyterian ministers to have their children baptised; and that he had railed from the pulpit against "particular persons of highest note" - the late Duke of Monmouth, the Earl of Argyle and the Earl of Melville, his Majesty's High Commissioner.

Some of these charges were of such a quasi ecclesiastical nature that they would be outwith the legal competence of a Church Court, but Mr. Heriot could be dealt with effectively on the ground

of purely ecclesiastical offences. The rest were make-weights to make sure his seditious sentiments were properly realized.

A FIRST AND SECOND VINDICATION

This harsh treatment which the Episcopalians had to suffer at the hands of the Presbyterian Church Courts produced a flood of letters to solicit aid from the English Bishops.²⁶ Bishop Rose of Edinburgh and Archbishop Paterson of Glasgow wrote to Canterbury, York and London pleading the cause of their distressed and afflicted Church. Sage, Morer and Munro wrote pamphlets about the plight in which the Episcopal clergy found themselves designed mainly for English readers. In part these appeals to England were successful in that English sympathy for the Scottish Episcopalians was roused. The work of these Episcopal apologists had consequences, too, in Scotland. Pamphlets in defence of Presbytery were produced by Presbyterian writers. Gilbert Rule²⁷ wrote a "First and Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland", published in 1691, in which he strenuously defends the actions of his fellow Presbyterians from the bitter attacks launched against them by Sage, Morer and Munro. In his "First Vindication", Rule partly answers the charges brought against the Presbyterians by saying that the Episcopalians have no right to bring such charges; since "in the late times Presbyterians suffered more hardship and

²⁶ Lambeth Palace Library MSS; Rawlinson MSS, Bodleian Library Oxford; Lloyd Baker Sharp MSS, see Chapter 3.

²⁷ Rule, Gilbert, A Vindication of the Church of Scotland: Being an Answer to a Paper, Intituled Some questions concerning Episcopal and Presbyterial Government in Scotland (1691)

barbarous cruelty than all of them have endured.²⁸ Then, having struck back at the Episcopalians in kind, and attempted to weaken their exaggerated accounts of the deposition of former Episcopal ministers - a duel in which, I think, he gets the better of the Episcopalian pamphleteers - he admits to the possibility of severe treatment in a minimum of cases. He insists strongly that they have all been censured by the Church Judicatories for "scandals that no man will have the brow to plead for". If two or three nevertheless have been censured on slender grounds, in spite of the warnings given to the Presbyteries against such action, he allows that "the late General Assembly hath committed it to some of the gravest and most experienced of their number to review such processes (where appeal or complaints have been made) and to relieve them who are so injured".

If, however, in the "First Vindication" he admits to harsh measures being used by the Presbyteries in the first flush of their return to power, in his "Second Vindication"²⁹ he is able to provide a more clearly defined account of Presbyterian fears, real or imagined; and of the deep distrust with which they viewed all former Episcopal incumbents and the schemes with which they were involved, schemes which met with Royal approval and support, but which they felt would lead to the destruction of Presbytery.

In his Preface to the "Second Vindication", Rule says:- "We are not ignorant of the measures that were the results of deep consults, both in this Nation and in London, when spite and malice

²⁸Rule, First Vindication, Preface

²⁹Ibid., A Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland: Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets (1691)

was not able to effect what they designed, that the several parishes should address the King for their ministers to be continued with them, even while it was evident that many of these regarded not the Civil Authority of the Nation now settled"

When this attempt did not succeed, it was concerted in London and advice about it written by Dr. Canaris to Mr. Leask to be communicated to the rest of the Party; that they should feign obedience to the Presbyterians at present, because their other methods could not take at that time. In pursuance of this advice two addresses were prepared for the Commission of the General Assembly It was evident by these that the addresses did not intend, nor desire, to be received into a share of the Government with Presbyterians. And these Papers were so ill contrived that it was visible to all, that no blame could reflect on the Presbyterians, by refusing to admit them on the terms that they proposed.

The attempt to test their case was put to the Commission of Assembly in July 1691. One Petition, in Mr. Leask's name, was given in to the Commission for the South, but since those who had signed it lived in the North he was instructed to apply to that Commission.

The other Petition was presented in the names of Mr. William Denune and Mr. Thomas Wood, and contained the names of 14 former Episcopal incumbents who claimed still to be in possession of their parishes in the Lowland Presbyteries - Clackmannan, Pencaitland, Fearne, Dunbar, Morebattle, Polwarth, Cranshaws, Tynninghame, Longformacus, Ellon, Haddington (2). Tranent, and a Mr. Alexander

Ireland, whose parish is not given. A strong group of these Petitioners held on to parishes in East Lothian and represent the strongest group of former Episcopalians in Lowland Scotland at the time.

The text of their Petition runs:- "To the Reverend the Ministers and Elders by law impowered to establish Judicatories of the Church of Scotland, the Humble Petition of the Ministers of the Episcopal Persuasion, sheweth: That whereas Episcopacy is by law abolished in this Kingdom, We, who have in the most dangerous times, manifested our zeal against Popery, are now ready to give all the assurances that are, or can be, by law, required of us, of our aversion to Popery; of our firmness for the Protestant Religion: and of our duty and fidelity to their Majesties, King William and Queen Mary. We are further ready and willing, in our respective charges and stations, to do everything that is incumbent upon us, as Ministers of the Gospel, for advancing the power of Religion, for suppressing of scandal and vice, and for securing the peace and quiet of their Majesties Government: and to act in Church Judicatories for carrying on of these ends, without any regard to the differences of persuasion in matters that are not fundamental. We do therefore humbly and earnestly desire, that in order to do these we may be suffered to act as Presbyters, in the Church, in our several stations and precincts".³⁰ This Petition failed to satisfy the Commission. Certain things in it appeared to them "to bear a dubious sense". When, however, the Petitioners were asked to explain these points they refused,

³⁰ Rule, Gilbert, A Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland: Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets, (1691) Preface, para. 2.

alleging that "they had no warrant to explain anything" either on their own behalf or on behalf of those who had sent them.

This seems a very strange refusal. Either it sprang from a stubborn unwillingness on the part of the Episcopalians to give more than a bare minimum of co-operation to the Presbyterians, or it meant that the Presbyterians were probing the real weakness in their case. They were asking questions which the Petitioners had no wish to answer. By their conduct they were confirming the Presbyterians in their suspicions.

The Commission gave its formal answer to the Petitions on 22nd July, 1691. They noted, firstly, that many of the signatures to the Petition were of ministers who had already been deposed or suspended for scandal or contumacy by their Presbyteries. These signatures, therefore, were not acceptable in Presbyterians' eyes. Their main answer, however, was as follows - "They find that seeing the Petitioners have not offered to own and subscribe the Confession of Faith, which by law is made the standard of the Doctrine of this Church, according to the instructions of the General Assembly; much less to acknowledge it, as is required by his Majesty's Gracious Letter; and whereas in the petitionary part, the Petitioners seem to desire an allowance for setting up a Government separate from, and independent upon that which is established by law; and have refused (when desired by the Commission) to explain either for their constituents, or for themselves, this, or any other expression, that seemed dark and doubtful to the Commission, declaring also expressly, that they have no further to say than what was contained in their Petition".

The Commission announced that they could not grant the

Petition but were, nevertheless, willing to receive "such of them as personally compearing, shall be found duly qualified according to the instructions of the Assembly, and his Majesty's Gracious Letter".³¹

Rule makes plain in what direction the Presbyterians fears lay.³²

1. They feared that the Episcopalians would not be faithful to the Government of the Church since they believed Episcopacy to be of Divine Right, and wished to see it restored "as it had lately been in Scotland".

2. "They were not prepared to put the Government of the Church into the hands of such as had been its declared enemies and gave no security that they would not overturn it for the future".

3. They were of the firm opinion that the Episcopalians were trying to set up separate Judicatories, and to obtain a legal recognition. This they could not countenance. Nor, it appears, would the King.

THE KING DEFIED

In the spring of 1691, a report of the Presbyterians' treatment of the former Episcopal incumbents was carried back to William at the Hague.³³ He immediately wrote to the Commission of the General

³¹Rule, Gilbert, A Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland: Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets (1691) Preface, para. 3.

³²Ibid., para. 4.

³³Annals and Correspondence of the Viscount and the First and Second Earls of Stair. Vol. II, p. 164.

Assembly in the plainest terms conveying to them his wishes on this subject. "They were to unite with those who are otherwise well qualified for the ministry, though they have served formally under Episcopacy: And that such of them as were turned out summarily and shall be called to vacant churches by the plurality of the heritors and the elders, where there is no just cause to the contrary, be admitted: And that as to any who complain of hardships in their sentences, they shall take their complaints into consideration, and deal impartially as the case requires, and put the King to no further trouble to consider these complaints, assuring them he will protect their persons and maintain the Government of the Church by Presbytery, and that he will suffer no invasion to be made upon it".³⁴

This instruction had reached the Commission of the General Assembly in February, 1691. From the treatment given to the two Petitions we have been considering which reached the Commission of Assembly in the July of that year it is apparent that scant regard had been given to the King's directions. A second letter³⁵ in the same strain was sent, therefore, to the Commission of Assembly from the King. It had no more effect.

The King could hardly be expected to allow the Assembly to continue in its bold defiant way. In 1692 he sent as his Commissioner the Earl of Lothian with a Royal letter³⁶ for the

³⁴ Leven and Melville Papers, p. 594. Letter Master of Stair to Lord Melville. February 13th, 1691.

³⁵ Annals and Correspondence Stair, Vol. II, p. 165.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 166-170.

Assembly couched in the strongest and plainest terms. The King complained that nothing had been done to further his plans to receive into the Church such of the former Episcopal incumbents as were willing to subscribe the Confession of Faith and take the Oath of Allegiance. (From the Petitions presented by the Episcopalians it is by no means certain that they were willing to fulfil either of these conditions. Here we must assume that the King had not been fully informed about affairs in Scotland. The Assembly, however, immediately sent a deputation to the Hague to present their case to the King.)

Next, the King intimated that he had instructed conforming ministers to apply to them for admission into the Church in terms of a formula and declaration which he had given to the Commissioner. In cases calling for enquiry he instructed the Assembly to set up two Commissions for the North and South of the Tay respectively, with a view to greater impartiality he instructed that one half of these Commissions should be old Presbyterian ministers, and the other half conforming ministers.

The Earl of Lothian, having presented the Royal Letter to the Assembly, then, made a speech in which he urged the Assembly to accept the King's directions. He pleaded that the hardships which the Presbyterians had suffered in former reigns should not be made a hindrance to the reception of Episcopal ministers into the Government of the Church, and pointed out that such a move would result in a double advantage. It would strengthen considerably the Presbyterian body, and would leave the non-conforming Episcopal clergy "without either party or abettors".

The Assembly was unmoved by either the King's Letter or the Commissioner's speech. These matters, which were of urgent and vital concern to the King, they referred to a Committee: and other Petitions which came in from Episcopal ministers met with the same reception.

The Assembly was ready to defy the King. The Commissioner, realizing that an impasse had been reached, according to his instructions, dissolved the Assembly without naming a day for its meeting again. A crisis in the relationship between the King and the Church had been reached.

The Master of Stair has some interesting comments to make in his letters to the Earl of Lothian about this head-on clash between the King and the Assembly. He regrets that the Assembly has taken "the course which must lose them to the King", and he believes that the King will "make such a set as will keep them in order": "If he does otherwise, I am sure it is more than they deserve at his hands".³⁷ This, undoubtedly, was the risk the Assembly ran, but Stair is hopeful of other consequences. He hopes that moderate Presbyterianism will rid itself of its extremists - "Who are for the extravagant height of Church meddling, or being opposed to, or independent on the civil authority". "Some weak men", he says "have always, to support their own interest, either suffered or instigated Churchmen to go to extravagances; and they believe such as will not bear or concur with them in this are their enemies, but truly they are their best friends who would make their government tenable, neither uncharitable to their brethren nor

³⁷Annals and Correspondence Stair, p. 170. Letter from Master of Stair to Earl of Lothian, January 26th, 1692.

undutiful to their sovereign".³⁸

It may be that the true nature of the crisis between the King and the Church was not fully appreciated at this stage by either side. At least, in this instance the King was not prepared to force matters to a head. The Assembly's intransigence appeared to be successful. The real break between the King and the Church over his Erastian demands, however, was merely postponed. The crisis broke with full fury next year. Bishop Burnet's view of Scottish affairs at this time suggests that the crisis was not without beneficial results both to the King and the Assembly. "The Presbyterians", he says, "began to see their error in driving matters so far, and in provoking the King so much: And they seemed desirous to recover his favour, and to manage their matters with more temper. The King came likewise to see, that he had been a little too sudden in trusting some, who did not deserve his confidence".³⁹

It appears that letters had been intercepted between France and Scotland in which it was stressed that Scotland could be engaged in King James's interest if no time was lost. Burnet says: "It seemed therefore necessary to bring that Kingdom into a better state".⁴⁰

The King's reappraisal of the situation in Scotland resulted

³⁸Annals and Correspondence Stair, p. 171. Letter from Master of Stair to Earl of Lothian, January 30th, 1692.

³⁹History of His Own Times, Burnet Vol. II, p. 120.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 121.

in the passing of two Acts in the spring of 1693.⁴¹ The first Act, "For settling the Peace and Quiet of the Church", provided more moderate terms for the reception of the former Episcopal incumbents into the legal Establishment. They were now required to make an Address to the General Assembly, and to acknowledge Presbytery to be the only legal government of the Church with a promise to submit to it. Upon which, within a fortnight after they had done so, if no matter of scandal was brought against them, the Assembly was either to receive them into the government of the Church, or, if this could not be achieved, the King was to take them into his own protection and maintain them in their parishes without any dependence upon the Presbytery. This Act was the King's reply to a recalcitrant Assembly. He was still determined to receive former Episcopal ministers into the one legal Establishment in spite of the Assembly. The fears and suspicions of the Presbyterians, however, about the former Episcopal incumbents were to be met by the passing of a second Act. This Act provided for an Oath of Allegiance and Assurance to be taken by all persons in positions of public trust, including all preachers and ministers of the Gospel. Thus all who held any office in Church or State had to own William and Mary as their King and Queen, "as well de jure as de facto", and promise fidelity to them against King James and all his adherents. Episcopalians, therefore, could be received into the Government of the Church, but only those who had by this Oath clearly renounced their Jacobitism. In addition, the "Act for Settling the Peace and Quiet of the Church" provided for

⁴¹Carstares State Papers. Life of Carstares. McCormick; p. 51-57

the Estates of Parliament to address their Majesties to call a General Assembly, thus presenting a way out of the impasse resulting from the dissolution of the Assembly by the Earl of Lothian.

William, however, sent down instructions that Ministers must subscribe the Assurance before they took their seats in the Assembly, and that if they refused to do so the Assembly was to be dissolved. This demand of the King the Church regarded as being in direct conflict with their principles of "intrinsic right". The King had no right to decide who would sit in the General Assembly of the Church.⁴² This was for the Church alone to decide. To make such a demand, in their eyes, was to exercise the same kind of Erastian supremacy over the Church as they had bitterly resisted during the previous reigns. This demand raised such a storm of wrath and defiance among Scottish Churchmen that only by the intervention of the King's advisers was a situation avoided that might have led to the wreck of the King's plans for Scotland, and to the complete alienation of the Presbyterians from his cause. The intervention which led to the withdrawal of the King's instructions has been attributed to William Carstares by McCormick in his "Life of Carstares", and has been followed by R. H. Story. Dr. Thomas Maxwell, however, in a Paper delivered before the Scottish Church History Society, entitled: "William and the Scots Presbyterians",⁴³ argues most

⁴²Story, R. H., Life of Carstares, p. 234-244

⁴³Maxwell, Dr. Thomas, William III and the Scots Presbyterians, Part I. The Crisis in Whitehall. A Paper to be published in the Records of the Scottish Church History Society (1965)

convincingly that the intervention by Carstares is romantic legend and has no basis in fact. He offers conclusive evidence that the intervention at Kensington which led to the King's instructions being countermanded at the last moment must have been made by Mr. Secretary Johnston.

William may have been unaware of the strength of Presbyterian principle which he had damaged when he insisted that ministers take the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance before taking their seats in the General Assembly. On the other hand, he may have been well aware that he risked the fury of the Presbyterians but considered it a risk that had to be run in order to force the Episcopal party into an Oath of Loyalty in unambiguous, legal terms. In the end the risk was worth taking. He could always withdraw the demand he had made of the Presbyterians. He had everything to lose in a head-on collision with the Church. He needed the support of the Church as much as the Church needed the support of the King. When the point of no return was reached the King accepted the advice of his advisers on Scottish affairs and withdrew his instructions. He did not withdraw his demands for the Episcopalians.

SOME SEAFIELD LETTERS

The Seafield Correspondence contains a large selection of letters which reveal the confused ecclesiastical situation in Banffshire at this time. Some of the letters provide valuable information about the reactions of the former Episcopal ministers to the requirement that they should take the Oath of Allegiance

and Assurance.

On 19th June, 1693, the Earl of Findlater, Sir James Ogilvie's father, qualified himself to the Government. Next day, he wrote a letter to his son, who was at this time their Majesties' Solicitor (later to become Earl of Seafield) giving him information about affairs in Banff:- "I was yesterday in Banff taking the Oath of allegiance and signing the insurance, and administering them to others. I can not at this time give you an account of the present condition of this shire, many are so puffed up with the apprehension of King James' landing, and they conclude King William gon, that trouble King William's friends are a little discouraged. God that created the worlde, and is the Lord of hosts secour and protect the Protestant interest, and bring order out of our confusions".⁴⁴

Sir James Ogilvie replies saying that he is glad to hear his father has qualified, and hopes that all the ministers in Banff will do the same. He discounts the rumours of a possible invasion:- "As for your Jacobin intelligence its not worth noticing".⁴⁵ But it had been a rumour nevertheless of considerable local significance.

On 11th October, 1693, he wrote to the Lord Advocate from Cullen about the Episcopal clergy. They had almost all refused the Oaths but most of them continued to preach in their Churches, and had asked him if they could safely do this. He says that

⁴⁴Seafield Correspondence. From 1685-1708, p. 104.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 106

he advised them that refusal to take the Oaths would mean deprivation, but wished to know what action the Privy Council would take with them. He suggests, however, that "some would yet comply if they were sure to keep their Churches".⁴⁶

Sir James Ogilvie is obviously still optimistic about some of the former Episcopalians. Given more time and security of tenure of Church, manse and stipend he expects that some will qualify. Two years later, Lord Saltoun, a son-in-law of Archbishop Sharpe, an Episcopalian but a Whig, writes to Sir James Ogilvie in the same strain, asking that the old Episcopal ministers should be given more time to comply. He also pleads that those who have been called to parishes by heritors and people be placed in the same category as the old ministers in parishes, and thus enable them too, to do "what in duty they ought to do on this occasion".⁴⁷ (Letter dated 22nd August, 1695).

Lord Saltoun speaks with the voice of moderate Episcopalianism. Unfortunately, he received little support from those he wished to encourage to qualify.

One of the Lord Advocate's letters to Sir James Ogilvie, dated 9th September, 1695⁴⁸ gives at least part of the reason for the reluctance of the former Episcopal clergy in the North to show willingness to qualify. They still had strong hopes of Jacobite Invasion. "It may be, he writes, "if we had heard sooner

⁴⁶ Seafield Correspondence. From 1685-1708, p. 109

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 167

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 169. Letter from Lord Advocate Steuart to Sir James Ogilvie, Edinburgh, 9th September, 1695.

of the taking of the Castle of Namur, more of our dissenting clergy would have come in. Five of nine in Haddington Presbytery have qualified themselves, and some few in other parts, but almost none in Perth, Angus and Fife that I hear of". He is suspicious of those of the Northern clergy who have come in, and thinks that this "will be accounted better service in England nor is reckoned by some here". His letter shows that the numbers who have qualified to the Government are not large, and he refers to what he believes to be the main value of the Oaths - "I have often said that the best use of Oaths and Subscriptions in Scotland was to discover upon refusal". In the Lord Advocate's view it was by their refusal to take the Oaths that the former Episcopalians inevitably declared themselves.

Bishop Burnet says that about 70 Episcopal clergymen took the Oaths to the King.⁴⁹ This is not a high figure, but it may include a number of ministers who were not actually in possession of parishes. There is in New College Library, Edinburgh a MS Book, "An Account of the State of the Church of Scotland since the year 1694".⁵⁰ This book lists the name of the incumbent against each Parish in Scotland, and states clearly whether he is an Episcopalian still in possession, or an Episcopalian who is Protected by law, or an Episcopalian who is a Non Juror. The total number of Episcopal ministers in parishes is given as 249. Only 20 out of this number are in the Lowland

⁴⁹ Burnet, History of His Own Times, Vol. II, p. 137.

⁵⁰ New College Library, Edinburgh, MSS Book. Uncatalogued. In possession of the Librarian, Dr. Lamb.

Presbyteries. Only 3 in the Lowlands enjoy Protection - the ministers at Longformacus, Haddington and Kinghorn. There are 43 Episcopal ministers still in charges in the Synod of Angus and Mearns, but only 4 are given as Protected. There are 64 Episcopal ministers still in parishes in the Synod of Aberdeen - 38 are listed as being Protected. In the Synod of Murray there are 33 Episcopal ministers still in parishes, but only one is Protected. In the Synod of Ross there are 31 former Episcopal ministers still in parishes, none is Protected. The best figure that can be obtained from this source for those who were Protected is 46.

Yet Sir James Ogilvie writing to Carstares, 26th October 1695,⁵¹ refers specifically to "116 of the Episcopal ministers in Churches qualified, besides those formerly assumed". While the "Leven and Melville Papers"⁵² refer to "Chamberlaynes present State of Great Britain" (1710) which states that 140 Episcopal ministers took Oaths to Government before September 1695.

The New College MS Book contains other information relating to this period - (a) List of Ministers' Names who being Presbyterians in anno 1661 did not conform to the Episcopal, who were alive and restored to their former charges by Act of Parliament 1690; (b) List of Episcopal Ministers received into Communion since 1690; (c) List of Episcopal Ministers deposed by Church Judicatories since the establishment of Government, 1690;

⁵¹Carstares State Papers, p. 263. Letter from Sir James Ogilvie to Carstares, 26th October, 1695.

⁵²Leven and Melville Papers, Preface, p. XXX.

(d) List of Intruders Judicially found and declared by Commission June and July, 1694; (e) State of the Kirk anno 1688 and 1689: the List of Ministers and Episcopal Ministers then. As far as it is possible to check the information contained in these lists there is no indication that any of them are inaccurate. In trying to arrive at an accurate assessment of the numbers of former Episcopal incumbents who took the Oaths to William and remained in their parishes under his protection there is little reason for not accepting the figure which the MS Book gives - 46. Whether, however, this is the true figure or not, it was from the Synod of Aberdeen⁵³ at the time of the 1715 Rebellion that there emerged, together with declared Episcopal intruders, and Episcopalians who had never taken the Oaths, a small but significant number of Episcopalians who had taken the Oaths to William and who had been allowed to remain in their parishes under protection of the King. The allegiance given to the King, then, in 1694, in many instances may be assumed to have been quite formal, in no way indicating a true shift of loyalty, but merely being a contrivance to meet the needs of the time.

⁵³ Minister of Banff
Fasti, VI, 276; 128, Minister of Keig; 226, Minister of Longside; 161, Minister of Inverury; 90, Minister of Coull; 55, Minister of Dyce; 38, Aberdeen, Dr. Burnett; 121, Minister of Kearn; 138, Minister of Strathdon; 156, Minister of Daviot. In Jacobites of Aberdeenshire and Banffshire in the Rising of 1715 by A. and H. Tayler, p. 218-245 there is given a List of 51 Ministers in various categories who supported the Rebellion. On p. 214-215 is a List of 7 Roman Catholic Priests who supported the Rebellion.

In 1690, the Assembly had passed several Acts⁵⁴ which show clearly the difficulties which had to be overcome in the Highlands and the North if a loyal Presbyterian settlement was to be achieved in these parts. Such was the shortage of ministers that an Act was passed prohibiting ministers from removing "out of this Kingdom" without special permission from the Courts of the Church. Presbyteries were instructed to take special notice of all Papists within their bounds, "that they might take pains how to reclaim them, and to advert how their children are educate".

The Highland Synods were instructed to receive and arrange for the distribution of a supply of Irish Bibles, the cost of which had been borne by "our neighbour Nation". The Privy Council was asked to provide one thousand pounds out of the stipends of vacant parishes to defray the expense of moving the Bibles to Scotland.

Kirk Sessions and Heritors were instructed to see that the Act of Parliament anent erecting Schools in every parish was duly enforced.

In the Letter to the King at the end of the Assembly, in which the Assembly reviews what it has enacted, it is made plain that these things have been done in order to "provide for the propagation of Religion, and the knowledge of God, in the most barbarous places in the Highlands", in the hope that this "may be the surest way of reducing these people also unto your Majesty's

⁵⁴ Acts of Assembly, 1690. Act Anent Ministers that observe not the Public Orders of the Church, 28th October; Act Anent Subscribing the Confession of Faith, 29th October; Act Approving Several Overtures, 29th October; Act Against Ministers Removing out of the Church, 31st October; Act Approving Overtures anent the Irish Bibles, 11th November; Assembly's Letter to the King, 13th November.

obedience". Now that the crisis of confidence between the King and the Assembly was over, and the Church was more certain of its own relationship to the Crown, the lines laid down by the Acts of Assembly 1690 were pursued with unremitting vigour.

It was imperative that a supply of Presbyterian ministers be provided for the Highlands and the North as soon as possible. To this end Acts⁵⁵ were passed ordering the Synods South of the Tay to provide 16 ministers to supply vacancies in the Synods of Angus and Mearns, Aberdeen, Murray, Ross, Sutherland and Caithness. The Commissioner was asked by the Assembly to apply to the Privy Council and the Lords of the Treasury that financial provision for such ministers should be met out of the stipends of vacant parishes.

The Commission of Assembly was instructed to inquire into the intrusion by Episcopal ministers into Kirks; to apply to the Privy Council to have such illegal and unwarrantable intrusion declared; and to have the Kirks which had been so intruded "orderly planted with their Lordship's assistance".

Following the principle of "direction" laid down by the 1690 Act of Assembly, a new Act was passed, "Against Fixing in the Lowlands Preachers who have the Irish language". This Act prevented ministers who spoke Irish from leaving the Highlands and seeking parishes in Lowland Scotland. The Assembly decreed that

⁵⁵ Acts of Assembly, 1694. Act approving Overtures anent a Commission of the General Assembly, and Instructions thereto, 13th April; Act appointing Ministers for the Supply of the North; Recommendations anent Vacant Stipends; Act Anent Intrusion in Kirks; Commission for the North; Act Against Fixing in the Lowlands of Preachers who have the Irish Language.

this restriction of movement was to continue, "till such times as the Highlands shall be completely provided with ministers".

The movement of trafficking priests among Highland families was to be severely curtailed, stopped if possible, their names to be given to the Privy Council, and the laws of the land brought into effect against them.

The Assembly of 1695 set up a special Commission⁵⁶ consisting of "some of the most experienced ministers and elders" to "expedite the planting of ministers on the Northside of the Water of Tay". This Commission was to sit in Edinburgh monthly to deal with the problems of the parishes North of Tay:- "Until there shall be settled on the North side of Tay twenty two ministers of some considerable standing and experience now belonging to Presbyteries on the south side of the same water". The Moderator of the Commission was empowered to transmit calls from parishes North of Tay direct to the Southern Presbyteries to be dealt with within eleven days. If the Commission's sentence of Transportation was not carried out within the time laid down by the Act then the minister who had failed to obey the Commission's instructions was to lie under pain of suspension until he obeyed. It was considered by the Assembly that forty four ministers in the Southern Presbyteries were fit to be transported to the North, and one half of them, upon receiving calls, were to be transported by

⁵⁶Acts of Assembly, 1695. Act Approving Overtures anent a more Expedite and Certain Way of Planting the North with Fixed Ministers.

virtue of this Act. The next year another Act⁵⁷ was passed which sent, in addition to the forty four, already mentioned, ministers from the Southern Presbyteries to the North who were to carry out an itinerant mission among the vacant parishes. The Assembly's Letter to the King in 1696 reflects the growing confidence of the Church in her Royal Protector. He is referred to as, "the Repairer of the breaches", "the Builder of the House of God", "the Restorer of the peace and liberty of Europe". The Assembly's prayer is, "that God will long bless and prosper him".

Three Acts in 1697⁵⁸ dealt with the supply of ministers for the North. "An Act for Punctual Obedience to Appointments of Ministers to supply vacant Churches"; "An Act anent those Ministers who have not obeyed the appointment of the last Assembly concerning the Mission to the North"; and, "An Act appointing some Ministers to go to the North quarterly, until the next Assembly".

These Acts ensured that Presbyteries fulfilled their quota of ministers to be sent to the North, that substitutes had to be sent if those originally nominated could not go, and, if any minister neglected this duty he was to be automatically suspended by his Presbytery for three months. Any appeal by a minister against the decision of his Presbytery to send him North was put directly

⁵⁷ Acts of Assembly, 1696. Act Nominating and Appointing Ministers to go North, by way of Mission, 3rd January; Assembly's Letter to the King.

⁵⁸ Acts of Assembly, 1697. Act anent these Ministers, who have not obeyed the appointment of the last Assembly, concerning the Mission to the North, 7th January; Act for Punctual Obedience to Appointments of Ministers for Supply of vacant Churches, 8th January; Act Appointing some Ministers to go for supply to the North quarterly, until the next Assembly, 12th January; Act Approving Overtures anent, and Instructions to a Commission for the more full and expeditious Planting of the North.

into the hands of the Agent of the Church. In the same year, in the Assembly's Instructions to its Commission for Planting the North it closed one more door against Highland ministers taking parishes in the Lowlands. Presbyteries on the South side of the Tay were prohibited from settling Probationers in their bounds who had been born North of the Tay.

In 1698 the King's letter⁵⁹ again makes plain William's wishes that, "Episcopal ministers whose lives and doctrines do render them useful to the Church" be assumed; and draws the attention of the Assembly to the situation in the remote Highland parishes, "where ministers are not provided, and where there appears to be so much need of a Reformation, both from Popery and Prophanity". (The Assembly acted in accordance with both these points. During the years 1694-1700 they assumed into full ministerial communion a total of 25 Episcopalian ministers, 3 in Argyll, 2 in Skye, 2 in Moray, 6 in Aberdeen, 1 in Fife, and 2 in Orkney and Shetland.)⁶⁰

The Overtures for 1698 show the practical steps the Assembly took to combat the menace of Popery and Disaffection in the North.

To provide ministers urgently for the Highland parishes the

⁵⁹ Acts of Assembly, 1698. King's Letter to the Assembly.

⁶⁰ Fasti (1871 Edition), Part VI, p. 522, Minister of Banchory Ternan, Received 1698; 548, Minister of Auchindoir, Received 1694; 549, Minister of Kearn, Received 1694; 557, Minister of Kennethmont, Received 1694; 582, John Turing, Demitted Inch in 1701, but Received thereafter and settled at Drumblane; 615, Minister of Tarves, Received 1694. Ibid., Part V, p. 383, Minister of Holm, Received 1698; 386, Minister of Durness, Received 1698; 402, Minister of Stromness, Received 1698; 408, Minister of Stronsay, Received 1700; 410, Minister of Burness, Received 1700; 425, 427, 429, 431 - Four Ministers from Lerwick Presbytery, Received 1698; 433, Minister of Mid South Yell, Received 1700; 435, Minister of Detling, Received 1700.

Assembly⁶¹ sent 5 ministers from the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, 4 from Lothian and Tweeddale, 2 from Merse and Teviotdale, 1 from the Presbytery of Coupar, 1 from the Presbytery of St. Andrews, and nominated 20 Probationers to be sent immediately to the North. One hundred merks out of the King's gift was to be allowed to "defray the charges of their journey thither".

An appeal was made to the Privy Council for more vigorous "execution of the laws against Papists, particularly seminary priests, popish schoolmasters, mistresses, governours, and pedagogues, and popish meetings".⁶² Highland Presbyteries were encouraged to use English speaking ministers both to preach and to catechize by means of an interpreter.

Ministers and Probationers who had "somewhat of the Irish language, but not a facility to preach in it", were to be sent to the North, "that they may learn more of the language and ability to instruct therein". Presbyteries and Universities were recommended to have "a special regard in the disposal of their bursaries" for the education of students who might one day "preach the Gospel in the Highlands".⁶³ In 1699, the Assembly⁶⁴ made special provision for the town of Aberdeen, and ordered the Synods of Lothian and Glasgow to send each quarter "a grave and experienced man for the supply of the town of Aberdeen". The Synod of Argyle was given the task of translating the Confession

⁶¹Acts of Assembly, 1698, Instructions to Synods, 21st January 1698

⁶²Ibid., Overtures Against Popery, 24th January, 1698.

⁶³Ibid., Overtures for Planting the Highlands.

⁶⁴Acts of Assembly, 1699, Overtures for Planting the North with the Approbation thereof, 3rd February

of Faith and the Larger Catechism into the Irish language.

Until the end of William's reign the Assembly concerned itself with the urgent task of planting the North with a Presbyterian parish ministry. In its Letters to the King the Church lavishes upon him unstinted praise. He is assured constantly of the Church's "hearty and dutiful concurrence" with all his plans to preserve the true Protestant Religion, at home or in Europe, from "the hazard and attack of all its enemies".⁶⁵

At the beginning of William's reign the Presbyterians had viewed the re-establishment of Presbytery with high enthusiasm, the extreme among them with almost fanatical dreams. The extremists hoped for the return of a Covenanted King. The more moderate were determined to establish the Church in her own intrinsic rights. It may be said that both parties were disappointed. The extremists found that they had to submit to the Assembly; the Assembly found that it had to accept a thoroughly Erastian establishment.

By the end of William's reign, however, two vital factors in the ecclesiastical state of Scotland had been made clear. First, the Presbyterians had shown themselves to be completely loyal to William's dynasty in spite of their high doctrine of Presbytery. Second, the Episcopalians had refused to accept him as King, and only a comparatively small group could be persuaded to take Oaths to him that gave them a certain protection and allowed them to continue in their parishes. Yet William never gave up his attempt to win over the Episcopalians. In his

Instructions⁶⁶ to the Commissioner to Parliament, 1698, the Earl of Marchmont, there is this significant instruction:-

1. You are to pass such Acts as shall be proposed in favours of the Presbyterian Church Government, which shall not be inconsistent with or prejudicial to our prerogative, or the protection granted to Episcopall ministers.

2. If any of the Episcopall ministers who are at present in their Churches shall apply to the Parliament, you are allowed to pass an act admitting them to qualify themselves according to law, and to give them our protection.

Episcopalians who would not qualify, and who remained outside the legal Establishment of his Church William had to consider always to be a potential risk to his dynasty. The one sure way to remove the danger was to bring them within the Establishment or to bind them to the Throne by Oath.

With William's death, however, the security which his Erastianism had provided for the Presbyterians came to an end. They might now have to stand without a Royal Protector. Anne was a Stuart Princess. Her reign could, therefore, be expected to bring with it a resurgence of Jacobite hopes. Her reign might bring more than a resurgence of hope. It might provide the Episcopalians with a chance to set up a second establishment in Scotland. It might even bring to them Restoration complete.

Such fears were very much in the minds of Scottish Churchmen

⁶⁶Seafield Correspondence, p. 238-239. Instructions to the Earl of Marchmont, Commissioner to the Parliament which sat from 19th July - 1st September, 1698.

when Anne's reign begins. Archbishop Tenison⁶⁷ received a long "Account of the Parties in Scotland", which sets out very clearly the dangers which the Church Establishment in Scotland feared in the new reign. It warns the Archbishop that the Episcopal Party in Scotland are all really in heart Jacobites what-ever some of them may pretend to the contrary: that their covert and real design behind their pleas for a Toleration is to disturb the peace of the Established Church: and the peace of the Kingdom; and that it is in her Majesty's true interest to maintain the Revolution.

As a forecast of events that were to take place during the new reign it proved to be remarkably accurate.

929

⁶⁷ Lambeth Palace Library MSS./No. 13. Account of Parties in Scotland, dated 1703, runs to 13 MS pages.

CHAPTER 3

THE AFFLICTED CHURCH

What were the fundamental principles for which Episcopalians stood in the post Revolutionary period? How highly developed, for instance, were the doctrines of Apostolic Order or Liturgical Worship? What was a Bishop? From whom did he derive his authority? Such questions as these the Afflicted Church began to face. At the same time how Jacobite was it?

In this chapter some of the contemporary evidence contained in Pamphlets and Sermons and Prayers is examined. The correspondence between the Scottish and the English Bishops is reviewed.

During the period strenuous efforts were made by the Scottish Episcopalians to gain English support for the Episcopalian cause in Scotland in spite of its Jacobitism. It may, I think, be fairly claimed that if there had been no Rebellion in 1715 these efforts might well have been successful.

Indifferent Episcopalians

Succession

Sermons and Prayers

Archbishop Tenison's Memorial

Recourse to His Grace of York

Bishop Compton's Awkward Question

The Bishop of Edinburgh's London Agent

INDIFFERENT EPISCOPALS

Duncan Forbes of Culloden, writing in 1696, in his "Memoir of a Plan for preserving the peace of the Highlands", says, "It is to be minded that there is a party in Scotland whose affections can never be gained by the King, and these are they who call themselves Episcopal but really are indifferent to that and all other matters of that nature, and are addicted to nothing but King James, under whose protection they formerly oppressed others, and, in spite of all kindness and forbearance can be shown them, will only comply to gain him back if they can".¹

Forbes's view is quite specific. He sees the whole emphasis in contemporary Scottish Episcopalianism as Jacobite. He appears to regard it as a movement in which little place was given to the doctrines which were associated in the minds of his fellow Scotsmen with classic Episcopacy, as they knew it, and saw it practised in England.

How Episcopal were the Scottish Episcopals? How Jacobite were they?

In 1690, John Sage, one of the most energetic of Episcopalian

¹Lawson, J.P., History of the Scottish Episcopal Church, p. 167

pamphleteers, published, "The Case of the Afflicted Clergy in Scotland truly Represented". It was a pamphlet designed to win support in England for their fellow Episcopalians in Scotland, and endeavours to present their case in the best possible light. It is, therefore, surprising to find him say, in dealing with the differences between the two parties in Scotland: "Moderate men will certainly think the differences between our Scot's Episcopacy and Presbytery not worth the heat or danger of a dispute". He proceeds to set down the things they held in common. In Doctrine, he says, they are both agreed. The Confession of Faith made by Mr. Knox together with the Westminster Confession of Faith are owned next to the Word of God by both parties. Worship, he says, is exactly the same both in the Church and the Conventicle. The Sacraments are administered in the same way: there is no kneeling, even at prayer, and all sit together at long tables. At Baptism the sign of the cross is not used. Godfathers and godmothers are not required, the father only promising for his child. Both parties, he claims, are the same in matters of Discipline. Common to each are Elders, Kirk Session, Presbyteries and Synods; Synods being presided over

by Bishops, whom he appears to regard as Constant Moderators.²

This same point of view is put forward in, "A Memorial for His Highness the Prince of Orange in relation to the Affairs of Scotland", in which the writer, anxious to win William's support for the Episcopate as then established by law, claims: "We have no Ceremonies at all, no not so much as any Form of Prayer, no musick but singing in the Churches, the Doctrine and Discipline is the same both in the Church and Conventicle; and in a word not one ace of difference between the two, but that in the present Church instead of their Moderators, whom themselves have sometimes confessed may be constant, we have Bishops".³

The Episcopalians, at least, could see no reason why William should prefer Presbytery to Episcopacy as these systems were understood in the Scotland of 1690. Between them, they claimed, there was no real difference. Yet there was, surely,

² Sage, John, The Case of the Afflicted Clergy in Scotland Truly Represented, p. 2-4.

³ A Memorial for HH the Prince of Orange in Relation to the Affairs of Scotland, p. 8

a vital difference between them; and it is to this difference that Duncan Forbes draws attention. Scottish Episcopacy possessed a theology of Kingship which proclaimed it irrevocably to be Jacobite. This was the vital issue between the two parties. This was the point of theological truth for which the Episcopalians contended.

In 1703, when the Presbyterians feared that the Episcopalians might be granted a legal Toleration, one of the reasons advanced by Presbyterian protagonists, such as James Webster⁴ and James Ramsay,⁵ against the Episcopalian claim was that there was no real need for a Toleration. There was no real difference in worship or doctrine between the two parties. It is argued by Webster, for instance, that few of the Episcopalians held to the doctrine of the "Divine right of Prelacy", and that those who do so have only recently taken up this position. In so doing, he asserts, they have abandoned their old principles, and "contradict their former practices in serving the King's ecclesiastical supremacy".

⁴ Webster, James, An Essay Upon Toleration by a Sincere Lover of Church and State, p. 18-19.

⁵ Ramsay, James, A Letter from a Gentleman to a Member of Parliament concerning Toleration, p. 3.

Were the Episcopalians of the Revolution really as indifferent to the high doctrines of Church, Apostolic Order, and Sacrament which came to be associated later with the essential Episcopal witness in Scotland? If they were not it is difficult to explain the struggle which Bishops Campbell and Gadderar had to engage in to establish the crucial concept of Diocesan Episcopacy, and the Sacramental worship of the Church embodied in "the Usages".

The weight of evidence contained in the Episcopal Chest, Edinburgh, shows that the real struggle to stand for "Apostolic Truth" and "Primitive Order" began after the Revolution, and took some years to gain the complete allegiance of the Episcopalians. No less an authority than Bishop Rattray,⁶ who was perhaps the greatest liturgical scholar of his time, has some very significant comments to make about the immediate post-Revolutionary period:- "We had no such thing as any office or liturgie among us", he says. The Holy Eucharist appears to have been celebrated about once a year; Long Tables, Preparation, Action, Serving, and Thanksgiving sermons were common features of both Episcopal and Presbyterian methods of celebration. About Confirmation, "which the Primitive and Catholick Church always looked upon as so very necessary for conferring the Holy Spirit on such as had received the Baptism of water", Rattray says: "It was not at all used by us".

⁶Gordon, J. F. S., Scotichronicon, p. 109-114 From a MS by Bishop Rattray, transcribed by Bishop Jolly from a copy in the handwriting of Bishop Alexander of Alloa: Episcopal Chest, Edinburgh, MS No. 227.

Again, concerning the cardinal Episcopal doctrines of "the Divine right of Episcopacy", and "the necessity of an Ordination by Bishops for conferring the Sacradotal Powers", Rattray says, "They were very little known among our laity", and "perhaps not by several of our clergy themselves".

Episcopal worship, it appears, continued in this "deplorable condition" until about 1707. The English Book of Common Prayer was used in a few private families, but about 1707 it begins to be introduced into "publick assemblies". This move, says Rattray, was supported by "the gentry and people of better fashion", and came also to be accepted by the "commons", but met with some opposition from the "elder clergy, who showed some backwardness to it".

It is significant that in 1707 the General Assembly⁷ thought it necessary to take some action about the setting up of the English Liturgy in Scotland, and showed its disapproval by passing an Act against such Innovations in the public worship of God in Scotland.

In Episcopal circles, too, the setting up of the Liturgy was still news. In a letter dated April 20th, 1707, Bishop Rose informs Mr. Archibald Campbell in London: "I had almost forgot to tell you that I had intimation by the Earl of Errol that the English Service was to be set up at Aberdeen". Campbell was his agent in England for the supply of Prayer Books, and, in this letter, he orders 154 Prayer Books "together with 24 of Mr.

⁷ Acts of Assembly, 1707. Act Against Innovations in the Worship of God, 21st April, 1707.

Nelson's Christian Sacrifice". He mentions, also, a "parish in Angus where the Service is set up lately", asks for 180 Books for Murray and a good number for St. Andrews, and gives every indication that the Liturgy is being set up in many other places besides.⁸

As late as 1712 the ministers of the Diocese of Aberdeen under Bishop Haliburton included as one of their reasons for regularly meeting together - "Encouraging the English Service in parishes where it will be acceptable".⁹

If Rattray could rightly regret the failure of the Episcopalians to stand for essential Episcopacy immediately after the Revolution, this omission appears to have been largely remedied by the year 1709. The high view of Episcopacy which then prevailed is clearly revealed in the very moving terms in which the Consecration of John Falconer and Henry Christie as Bishops is recorded. These Consecrations took place at Dundee, on April 28th, 1709.¹⁰ "We have this day admitted as Associates in our Episcopal College, by the Divine Right of Consecration, to that portion of the before mentioned Scottish Church, which has its warfare in God, with the Province or Jurisdiction of: and we entrust it to their Episcopal care, until God, in his great

⁸Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh. MS. No. 1801. Letter from Bishop Rose to Mr. A. Campbell, April 20th, 1707.

⁹Ibid., MS. No. 6(a). List of Ministers of the Diocese of Aberdeen who still regard Bishop Haliburton as their Ordinary, 1712.

¹⁰Scotichronicon, p. 124

mercy, see fit to deal with His, alas! now afflicted Church, the Bride of His dear Son, in this corner of the earth. Adding this also, our most ardent wish, that relying upon the Lord, and undeterred by the storm of persecution, our brethren will watch with anxious solicitude that the high and most sacred Order of Bishops, continued by the Succession of lawful Ordination, may never fail or cease."

This view of the Episcopate which is contained in the account of the Consecrations at Dundee is again apparent in John Falconer's writings about the apostolic ministry. "We are obliged," he says, "to enquire accurately into the commission of ministers of Religion, since on that the validity of the Sacraments depends, unless the Sacraments we receive be valid, we can have no assurance of salvation after a legal ordinary way."

I know the Socinians, the Armenians, the Calvinists, the Independants, and the Presbyterians, have erected schemes of divinity different from this, but this is that which was once and first delivered to the saints by the Spirit of Jesus Christ, and I will trust to no other in such important matters".¹¹

SUCCESSION

The claim to possess, what, it was alleged, the Presbyterians did not, namely, Apostolic Succession, became one of the main tenets of Scottish Episcopal belief. This was the priceless possession which made their afflicted Church the true Church of Christ in Scotland. The lack of it reduced the Established Kirk to the level of an apostate sect in their eyes. Thus we find John Miln, one of the Episcopal ministers in Edinburgh, preaching

¹¹ Scotichronicon, p. 186-7

a "Sermon on St. Simon and St. Jude's Day", 28th October, 1714, in which he says: "They who cannot derive their succession from Christ and His Apostles, lay their foundation in the sand: and whatever purity any sect or party may pretend to in doctrine and worship, and that they prophesy in Christ's name. He will profess unto them, I never knew you".¹²

In 1705, Robert Calder published a pamphlet, "The Divine Right of Episcopacy; wherein is shown that there can be no lawful ministry, but what comes by Apostolic Succession".¹³ His aim is to prove that Episcopacy is of Divine Right; firstly, from the Old Testament; secondly, from the New Testament; thirdly, from reason; fourthly, from antiquity and the practice of the universal Church.

One of the main foundations upon which he bases his whole argument is his doctrine of Succession. "Succession", he says, "was the foundation or principle by which the Old Testament priesthood was preserved in the line of Aaron, or in the tribe of Levi. Succession was the principle of unity in the Jewish Church, by which they could discover any new faction and schism Was it not then easy to determine, who was the lawful successor of Aaron, when Manasseh brother to Jaddi Priest of Jerusalem, set up a schismatical Temple on Mount Gerizim ...? Was it not then

¹² Miln, William, Practical Essay proving the Christian Religion to be from God. Together with an Apology for the Episcopal Church in Scotland: A Sermon preached in one of the Meeting Houses of the City of Edinburgh on Thursday 28th October, being St. Simon and St. Jude's Day, Preface, p. 4.

¹³ Calder, Robert, The Divine Right of Episcopacy: Wherein is shown that there can be no lawful Ministry but what comes by Apostolic Succession, p. 16-17

(I say) easy to determine, which was the true Church? And who was the successor of Aaron? Doth not our Saviour determine the debate betwixt Jerusalem and Samaria, with the Woman when He says (John 4), Salvation is of the Jews? That is, there the true ministrie and means of salvation, are to be found".

In a remarkably similar way the Old Testament is searched for evidence which will support a Divinely ordered Monarchical Succession. The Succession from Adam to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses, from Moses to Saul, from Saul to Nebuchadnezzar, from Nebuchadnezzar to Christ, are all examined in minute detail, and put forward by the advocates of the Succession theory as irrefutable proof of the Divine right of Monarchy, guaranteed by lineal Succession, proved by Holy Writ. With similar enthusiasm this evidence was as strenuously criticised, ridiculed and demolished by opponents of the Succession doctrine.¹⁴

So similar is the type of evidence used, the line of argument developed, the conclusions drawn for both doctrines of Succession that one is forced to ask questions about the relationship between them. Scottish Episcopalianism bore witness at the Revolution, and in the immediate post Revolution period, to the high, uncompromising doctrine of Monarchical Succession in the Divine ordering

¹⁴ Hereditary Right not Indefeasible: Or some Arguments founded upon the unalterable Laws of Society and Government, proving that the Right claimed by the Jacobites can never belong to any Prince or Succession of Princes, by a True Scotchman, p. 13, 21-24; Fleming, Robert, The History of Hereditary Right from Cain to Nero: Wherein its Indefeasibleness and all other such late Doctrines concerning the absolute power of Princes, and the unlimited obedience of Subjects, are fully and finally determined by the Scripture standard of Divine Right, by the late Rev. Robert Fleming, p. 26-120; The Judgement of Whole Kingdoms and Nations, concerning the Rights, Powers, and Prerogatives of Kings, and the Rights, Privileges and Properties of the People, p. 6-116

of Kings. After its disestablishment there develops a doctrine of Episcopal Succession as the mark of the Divinely instituted Church which bears many of the characteristics previously claimed absolutely for the Divine Right of Monarchy. This would seem to be a reasonable deduction from Bishop Rattray's evidence.

It is possible that this high, absolute doctrine of Apostolic Succession was latent in the doctrine of Monarchical Succession, submerged by it, and only struggled free from it after the Revolution. On the other hand, it is possible that the doctrine of Episcopal Succession derived its absolutism from the Divine Right of Kings theory to a degree that has not been allowed so far by Episcopalian apologists. While it is impossible to be dogmatic about such a question, it is, nevertheless, necessary to ask it and attempt to define certain possible relationships.

Certainly it can be claimed that the theory of Apostolic Succession was not held at this time independently of the theory of Monarchical Succession. The Rights of the Divinely appointed Bishop had not yet been separated from the Rights of the Divinely appointed King. This crisis in Scottish Episcopal thinking had to await the impact of Bishop Gadderar on Scottish Episcopal affairs.

One wonders, also, to pursue this question of Succession in a slightly different, but nevertheless, closely related direction, what would have been the reaction of such English theologians as Sherlock, Lloyd or Burnet, if the crisis in English Church life at the Revolution had come to them in somewhat different terms? If they had faced a situation in which all the English Bishops had

refused to accept William and Mary as King and Queen would they not have been forced to rethink their traditional doctrine of Apostolic Episcopal Succession as radically as they were obliged to rethink their traditional theology of Divinely instituted, indefeasible, lineal, Monarchical Succession? Were they precluded from having to face this issue by the mere accident of historical event? It is only possible to ask such an intriguing question. It is perhaps a question to which there is no real answer.

SERMONS AND PRAYERS

From tilting at such intriguing conjectures we must return to the more certain aspects of Scottish Episcopalian Jacobitism revealed in several fragments of Sermons and Prayers, preserved in the Episcopal Chest,¹⁵ Edinburgh. They leave us in no doubt that the Divine Right of the King was to the Episcopal Church a passionate item of faith.

The Episcopal Chest contains notes on a Sermon preached in Edinburgh on 7th January, 1707, on the text, 2 Samuel, 14:13 - "Now Joab perceived that the King's heart was towards Absalom and hereupon falls about methods for bringing home the King's son ... From this we may observe - that as Kings' sons have good and undoubted right to their fathers' crown, so it is an incumbent duty upon the subjects and servants of a King to plead for the homebringing of the banished heir.

"My friends, we are to understand in the first place that it is God only that makes Kings and not men. (2 Kings, 9:6) Thus saith the Lord I have appointed the King over Israel. (2 Samuel 7:16).

¹⁵ Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, Fragments of Sermons, MS.
MS. 207-245

He established them and theirs upon the throne. And their house and their Kingdom shall be established for ever. (1 Kings. 15:9). Nevertheless for David's sake did the Lord his God give him a lamp in Jerusalem to set up his son in Jerusalem and to establish Jerusalem Tho' he was a disobedient son and disobeyed and walked not by the laws of his God. Yet the Lord would not dethrone him, and that for two reasons - (1) For David's sake to whom he lineally succeeded. (2) Because he was the King's son, and had right to the crown as the Lord had promised - And thy House and thy Kingdom shall be established for ever. And tho' he was a wicked king yet not only he but his children sat upon the throne of David

"They are holden faulty who neglect the Banished. He is the apparent heir. It is the express will and command of God. This law is binding upon the subjects and servants of a King".

The preacher then turns to the New Testament and deals with the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen. (Luke 20:13) - "Then said the Lord of the vineyard, I will send my beloved son, it may be they will reverence him. Dearly beloved, let it not be said of you, as they said of the wicked and disobedient servants This is the heir, come let us kill him that the inheritance may be ours Scotland, wilt thou disinherit thy Masters son; will ye destroy the heir; are there no true Scotsmen amongst you; are there none that will plead for the homecoming of the Banished?"¹⁶

The Episcopal Chest contains, also, several manuscripts of

¹⁶ Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh. Fragments of Sermons MS, No. 242

Prayers and Intercessions,¹⁷ produced apparently for use at this period. The first manuscript from which we quote is headed - "Prayers for the King, to be made use of, taken from the Form of Prayer before the Restoration".¹⁸

It is sufficient to quote only one of the prayers for it illustrates very clearly the spirit which inspires them all:-

"O God of all Might and Wisdom, by Whom alone Kings reign, and people are made obedient to them; we most humbly beseech Thee to defend thine own ordinance in defence of our distressed King: that as Thou hast given him a most just title to his fathers kingdoms, so Thou wouldst vouchsafe to put the spirit of counsel, of courage, and of unity upon them that are loyal to him. And for those that either openly oppose him or those strange children that disemble with him, that Thou wouldst infatuate their counsels, and blast their endeavours, turning their hearts both to Thee their God, and to the King, which we beseech Thee to grant for Jesus Christ His sake, our Lord and only Saviour. Amen."

The Second manuscript from which we quote runs to fourteen handwritten pages, and is headed, "Office for Intercession for 1713".¹⁹ It is dated 3rd July of that year. It is full of burning, intense petition, and sets forth, as in the presence of God, the faith of the Episcopal Church at this time in the absolute right of the God-ordained King; their utter conviction that in this matter they were on God's side; their belief that in

¹⁷Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh. Liturgical MSS, No. 1013-1052.

¹⁸Ibid., MS. 1029. Prayers for the King Taken from the Form of Prayer before the Restoration.

¹⁹Ibid., MS, 1030. Office for Intercession for 1713, July 3rd.

His own appointed time he would restore the King; and in so doing bring the Kingdom of Scotland back to His own obedience:-

"We flee unto Thee on behalf of One who has no helper, but Thee alone: One against whom the rulers have taken counsel, against whom the assembly of the mighty ones have set themselves, against whom the madness of the people and the rage of the beasts of the earth have conspired. One who is made a monster unto many because in the wisdom of Thy providence Thou didst ordain him to hand in a lot not pleasing to them: One who is judged and condemned unheard, and hath none upon earth to appeal unto: One who is therefore a criminal in their eyes, because it was Thy will that he should be born into this world, and be the heir of that, which it is not their but Thy right only to give: One who is reviled and scorned by the proud, mocked and scoffed at by men viler than the earth, abhorred by libertines, grinned at by them that sit in the seat of the scornful, by the dogs of the city, and by the free thinkers that have not God in all their thoughts They have their armies and their fleets, their strong and powerful confederacies, their treasures and fortresses, their oaths and their statutes according to their own inventions, and all the fences and barriers whichever their hearts could devise, wherewith to strengthen themselves: But he Thy servant, is poor and naked and destitute; driven from place to place, as one excommunicated from the face of the earth He hath no helper but Thee alone; None else is permitted to succour him, Lord, because they have cast him out from the inheritance which Thou gavest him, and have rebelled against Thee, whose is the earth and the fulness thereof.

"Our trust and our confidence shall be in Thee and in Thy truth which endureth for ever, - that Thou wilt be pleased to make known to the sons of men, Thy mighty acts in relief of Thy persecuted servant, and the glorious majesty of Thy Kingdom, in giving him the throne of his father, at thine own appointed time.

"Almighty and everlasting God - we are taught by Thy Holy Word, that the hearts of kings are in Thy rule and governance, and that Thou dost dispose and turn them as it seemeth best to Thy heavenly wisdom, we humbly beseech Thee to turn the hearts of all Christian Kings, Princes and Governours, and particularly of the Emperor and the Northern Potentate, towards Thy servant, our natural born

Lord under Thee and Thy Christ, in his distress and forlorn condition, as to pity, relieve and assist him according to all the circumstances of his state and dignity, for Thy honour only; or else so immediately to interpose Thyself, without any of their relief and assistance, as Thou in Thy wisdom shall see most fit.

"So turn his heart unto Thee alone that he may never for the sake of an earthly Crown, do anything unworthy of that high character wherewith he is honoured by Thee; So direct and confirm him by Thy Spirit as he may be made an instrument in Thy hand, towards a more perfect reformation than hath yet been, according to the true primitive and Catholick standard undoubtedly delivered, in the beginning by our Lord Jesus Christ Thy Son, and His Apostles.

"We further beseech Thee, so to turn and dispose the heart of his sister Thy servant who by the permission of Thy providence at this time sitteth in his place, that she may honour Thee by honouring the memory of her Father, and doing that now for Thy glory which it was not possible to do while he was living: that so she may obtain hereby the blessing of the first commandment with promise, and obtain an everlasting remembrance among princes of pious and excellent renown, wherefore, o Lord, pour into her heart, with the faith, fear and love of Thee, a spirit of holy magnanimity and resolution, that so the kingdom may not be rent from her in thine armour, as it was from a king of Israel, because he feared the people and obeyed their voice And when she goeth to the altar, speak, o Lord, secretly in her heart for this end, and bid her remember, before it is too late, whether her brother hath aught against her, that so she may be first reconciled to him, and then come and offer her gift".

The Office of Intercession ends with this blessing - "The Lord bless him and keep him; the Lord lift up the light of his countenance upon him; the Lord direct him in all his ways, and prosper him in all his enterprizes; the Lord crown him with all the blessings of David and Solomon, yea with the blessings of Jesus the King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Amen".

While men are often prepared to play a part to deceive their fellowmen about their real hopes and ambitions, they are not so ready to do so in their prayers before God. These passionate

prayers are the outpourings of a deeply rooted faith, a faith that went far beyond the science of political Jacobitism and saw in the Restoration of the King an event which would herald both Revival and Reformation.

Loyalty to the exiled King had become so much a part of the faith of the Scottish Episcopal Church that for a member to give up that loyalty involved very great spiritual danger.

The Episcopal Chest contains a manuscript of twelve pages dealing with the whole issue of Loyalty²⁰ to the King. This loyalty is held to be "one of the fundamental principles of our Communion"; to abandon it or give it up put a man "under the sentence of the lesser excommunication, that is being excluded from the Holy Eucharist and the Prayers"; none but "the faithful members of our Communion" having a right to these privileges. Disloyalty of this kind placed in hazard the invaluable spiritual and eternal concerns of the next world; continued impenitence might result in an even greater excommunication falling upon the impenitent's head.

There can be no more heinous sin than this, and in stark damning sentences it is portrayed in all its dishonour, abomination and blasphemy.

ARCHBISHOP TENISON'S MEMORIAL

After the disestablishment of Episcopacy in Scotland strenuous efforts were made by exiled Episcopalian clergymen in England to

²⁰Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, Liturgical MS, 1033. Loyalty. Those who have given up. An Address moving them to Repentance.

interest the English hierarchy on behalf of the distressed and afflicted Church in Scotland. Foremost among these agents of Scottish Episcopacy were men like Dr. Munro, the deprived Principal of Edinburgh, and Archdeacon Fall of Glasgow. "James Gordon's Diary"²¹ shows that during this period he was in constant communication with Chalmers, the Scottish Episcopalian agent in London. A stream of Letters, Petitions, Addresses, and Pamphlets was sent across the border to plead the cause of Scottish Episcopacy.²² Where the printing of such material proved difficult in Edinburgh, it was done in London, and circulated from there. We are bound to try and estimate the success of this propaganda from Scotland.

It is of considerable importance in this study that we discover the view of the leading English clerics about affairs in Scotland. The Letter Books of Archbishop Tenison, the private correspondence of John Sharp, Archbishop of York, and Henry Compton, Bishop of London, provide us with answers to the questions we must ask. We may assume that the English Bishops were prepared to go to considerable lengths to help their fellow Episcopalians in Scotland. It would be wrong, however, to think that they were prepared to advance the cause of a disloyal Church. Did the Jacobitism of the Scottish Episcopalians effectively sabotage any serious efforts which might have been made on their behalf by the leaders of the Established Church in England? How far were Tenison and Compton, or even a High Church Tory like Sharp,

²¹Henderson, G.D. James Gordon's Diary, 1692-1710, p. 15-17.

²²Carpenter, E.F. Life of Thomas Tenison, p. 187

prepared to trust without question their Scottish Episcopal correspondents?

Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, was a staunch supporter of the Protestant Succession as established by law. He saw no possible security for the Church of England under a Roman Catholic Sovereign, and he was stubbornly against the Toryism of the High Church Party, which, he was convinced might well play into the hands of those whose real loyalty was to St. Germaines.

Scotland, therefore, presented no easy problem for the Archbishop. He could not be expected to view in any kindly way the disestablishment of Episcopacy which had taken place. Yet he knew well that the future security of his own Church was bound up with the Protestant Succession in William's dynasty, and hence was bound up very closely with the fortunes of that dynasty in Scotland. What help could he give to a party in Scotland whose loyalty to the Crown was suspect; who might well launch themselves into open revolt if a suitable opportunity occurred? He listened to the grievances which came to him from Scotland and drew up for the King a very fair, but at the same time a careful and cautious Memorial on their behalf.

In this "Memorial Concerning the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland"²³ it is apparent that the one condition required for help from England was loyalty to the Crown.

²³Lambeth Palace Library, MSS, 929. No. 10. Memorial Concerning the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland.

1. He wishes to see, for instance, those Episcopal clergy who have taken the Oath of Allegiance, and who had prayed publicly for the King, and who were still in livings protected by the King: he gives this number as about 400.

2. He wishes to see Episcopal ministers tried on the charge of scandal to be heard in their own defence, and not to be ejected before they had been given a full hearing.

3. He suggests that the revenues of the Bishoprics (some £5,000) should be used for the support of "such of the Bishops who now live in that Kingdom as are not disaffected and are in straits, if they address the King in Council or Treasury or either of his Secretaries to that purpose, though they cannot qualify according to the Act of June 13, 1693, without degrading themselves".

4. He is anxious that vacant livings be filled as soon as possible with good men, and asks that some of those who have been rabbled, "if they qualify" be put into such livings, since they and their families are generally said to be "in a starving condition".

In his Memorial the Archbishop deals, also, with the scruples which his Episcopal brethren had about the 1693 Act. From the Episcopal point of view some of them are perfectly understandable. They carry a certain amount of weight. Nor is there any doubt that William was willing to do everything in his power to meet what were genuine scruples. On this issue Tenison's advice was:- (1) The Episcopalians scrupled the Assurance because they were not sure about some of the clauses in the Act, but they would promise "All Assurance of their loyalty in plain words, and all such as are given by their brethren in England and Ireland". (2) They scrupled

the term "only Government of the Church in that Kingdom".

(3) They scrupled the subscribing of the Confession of Faith because they regarded it as a Creed. (4) They scrupled subscribing a strict observance of uniform Presbyterian worship which disallowed the use of the Lord's Prayer, the Doxology, the Saying of the Creed at Baptisms, and even the reading of "the plainest chapter of the Bible to the people".

Tenison's advice was wholly in line with William's policies for the treatment of the Episcopalians in Scotland. Apart from the provision for the former Bishops out of the Bishopric revenues, which might have succeeded if the Bishops had not been disaffected to the Government, and which failed even in Anne's reign, the points which Tenison makes were largely met.

The unknown and unknowable factor in Tenison's appreciation of the sentiments of the Scottish Episcopalians was the depth of their Jacobite belief. How many held scruples against the 1693 Act who did not at the same time hold stronger scruples against accepting William as King? Events were soon to provide the Archbishop with the opportunity to view both sets of scruples in their correct historical relationship.

In 1695, William was engaged in fighting a war on the Continent²⁴ which could be regarded as a Protestant crusade to establish a Free Europe. Villeroy, the French commander, was trying to entice William away from the siege of Namur by his victories at Dixmude and Deynze and his threat of an attack on

²⁴ Macauley, History of England, Vol. IV, p. 594.

Brussels. If Villeroy succeeded there would be a serious threat of a Jacobite Rising. Rumours reached England that there had been a great battle in which the Allies were defeated, the King had been killed, and the siege raised. Upon these rumours reaching Scotland Tenison was informed that some of the Episcopal clergy had changed their minds about the Oath of Allegiance.

He wrote immediately to Mr. Secretary Johnstone, 20th August, 1695, concerning the news he had received from Scotland. "Conscience", he wrote, "does not fall or rise according to the weather of the state, and therefore I hope that they do and will approve themselves very dutiful to the established Civil Government and give them demonstration of their Allegiance. I am sure the King is not desirous to put hardship upon them, and I hope they will not draw any upon themselves, but be free both from the crimes and suspicions of disloyalty".²⁵

On 26th August Namur fell. The menace of a Jacobite Rising receded. A number of the Episcopal clergy had second thoughts, and decided to take the Oaths to Government.

A Loyal Address was sent up to the King which Tenison acknowledged in a letter of 23th November, 1695. He speaks of the great satisfaction it has given him, and how well it had been received by the King. It will not pass unrewarded he promised; for "the King will certainly give you his protection whilst you continue exemplary Christians and good subjects". But he ends his letter with a sentence which shows how well aware he was of the opposition the Loyalists had to face from within their own

²⁵Lambeth Palace Library MSS. 930, No. 205. Archbishop of Canterbury's letter to Secretary Johnston touching the Allegiance of the Episcopal Clergy, August 20th, 1695.

Church. "Perhaps there may be some ill men who, being in other interests, may reproach you for doing your duty, but if you suffer for well doing, happy will you be, and the shame will, at least, rest upon your enemies. For my part I shall be ready at all times, to do all the good offices I can in my station".²⁶

The bitterness which existed between the Episcopalians who had taken the Oaths and enjoyed the King's protection, and those who had not, is mentioned in a letter from Alexander Cairncross²⁷ to the Bishop of London, 4th January, 1698. In this letter he states that he and his friends, who enjoy the King's protection, are "slighted by the Jacobites for their loyalty and affection to the present Government", and are "hated by the Presbyterians for their serving under Episcopacy".

RECOURSE TO HIS GRACE OF YORK

In ancient times the Archbishops of York had asserted their jurisdiction in Scotland over certain Sees; namely, St. Andrews, Glasgow, and all Scotland South of the Forth. Scottish Episcopalians turning to England for help after their disestablishment were certain of obtaining a sympathetic hearing when they sent their letters, complaints and petitions to John

²⁶ Lambeth Palace Library MSS. 930, No. 190. Archbishop of Canterbury's letter to Mr. Seton and the rest of the Episcopal Clergy who have lately taken the Oaths in Scotland, November, 28th, 1695.

²⁷ Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MSS, 985, No. 38. Letter from Alexander Cairncross to the Bishop of London, 4th January, 1698.

Sharp, Archbishop of York.²⁸

Unlike Tenison, Sharp was by conviction both a high Churchman and a Tory. He would have liked to see Episcopacy established again in Scotland, and argued to this end at the private meetings of the English Commissioners prior to the Union.²⁹ It could be assumed that he, too, would do all in his power to assist his persecuted brethren in Scotland.

In June, 1693, a Memorial was sent to him which set out the story of the ejections and persecution of Episcopalians in Scotland after the Revolution; it was stressed, too, that worse was feared for the future. "In this time of our great distress", the Memorial said, "our only refuge next to the Divine providence and their Majesties innate goodness and justice, is to have recourse to your Grace and the reverend clergy of the Church of England We can assure your Grace we are still the same we hitherto professed ourselves to be, and we are resolved whatever measures we meet with, to persist in our loyalty and fidelity to their Majesties, and will be ready to give such further proofs thereof as are consequential to our former professions, and proper to persons of our character and circumstances. We do therefore humbly entreat that your Grace may be pleased seriously to consider our present case, and to represent the same to their Majesties; so

²⁸ Hart, Tindal, The Life and Times of John Sharp Archbishop of York, p. 280-282.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 211; Trevelyan, G. M. England Under Queen Anne Ramillies, Vol. 2, p. 231.

as yet we may subsist under the favourable influences of their royal protection, and our feared ruin and desolation may be prevented".

The Archbishop raised these matters with the Duke of Hamilton and others of the Scotch nobility in London. Whether Sharp was aware of the reservations and qualifications in this document about the promised loyalty of the Episcopal petitioners to the King, Hamilton left the Archbishop in no doubt about the mind of the Scottish Parliament on this subject. He allowed that the King might be asked to give clear and express instructions to Parliament concerning the terms upon which former Episcopal clergy could be received into the Church, so that matters of this kind were not left entirely in the hands of the General Assembly; but to take off the Assurance was unthinkable; a thing the Scottish Parliament would never agree to. This intransigent attitude convinced Sharp that the best service he could render the Scottish Episcopalians was to raise money for their support, and this he set himself most assiduously to do.³⁰

In "The Life and Times of John Sharp Archbishop of York", Tindal Hart³¹ deals at some length with the private papers and correspondence of the Archbishop preserved in the Lloyd-Baker MSS.

³⁰ Sharp, Thomas, Life of John Sharp, Vol. 2, p. 383-386

³¹ Hart, Tindal, Life and Times of John Sharp Archbishop of York p. 281-285. Lloyd Baker Sharp MSS. The Lloyd Baker Sharp MSS consist of the entire private correspondence and private papers of Archbishop John Sharp, and are in the possession of Lt. Col. A.B. Lloyd Baker of Hardwicke Court, Gloucester.

This correspondence contains a most valuable collection of letters from Scottish sources, including letters from Bishop Rose of Edinburgh and Archbishop Paterson³² of Glasgow, pleading with urgency the plight of their distressed and afflicted Church. Mr. St. George of Glasgow³³ writes in February 1695, protesting that the Scotch clergy are being "violently and illegally" dispossessed of their churches and livelihoods. Six years later, in November 1701,³⁴ the Archbishop is informed by another correspondent that even those clergymen who have qualified according to law are in a deplorable condition through the violent and illegal proceedings of the Presbyterian judicatories.

In 1702, Bishop Rose³⁵ writes:- "The deplorable circumstances of our suffering clergy, scarce otherwise to be relieved save by some supplies from abroad, have obliged me to offer their case both to my Lords of Canterbury and London".

In 1709, appeals and complaints reached Sharp telling him of yet another wave of persecution following the threatened Jacobite invasion of 1708.

The Bishop of Edinburgh³⁶ complains bitterly that the Acts of Parliament are being so interpreted, especially the Act of

³²Ibid., p. 285. L.B.S. MSS, Box 3, Bundle M.16,17,18,19,20,21,22,24, contain letters from Archbishop Paterson of Glasgow, dated March 1704-February 1705.

³³Ibid., p. 281, L.B.S. MSS, Box 3, Bundle M.15.

³⁴Ibid., p. 281, L.B.S. MSS, Box 6, Bundle M.6.

³⁵Ibid., p. 282, L.B.S. MSS, Box 3, Bundle M.5.

³⁶Ibid., p. 283, L.B.S. MSS, Box 3, Bundle M.9.

Union, as if they meant that no form of Worship was allowed in Scotland except that of the Presbyterian Church.

The old Countess of Lauderdale³⁷ wrote to him asking him to make representation to the Queen about the closing down of two Meeting houses in Edinburgh where the English Service had been in use.

The celebrated Mr. Greenshields³⁸ wrote a long Memorial setting out his case. This Memorial was sent to the Archbishop, with a covering letter, by Bishop Rose.³⁹ Rose writes:- "This harsh treatment of our brother plainly shows that whatever pretences our enemies made for their persecutions, yet Episcopacy and the English Service are the main grounds of the quarrell. They rage exceedingly to find the Service of the Church taken so mightily with such multitudes among us wherefore they are now plainly above board, by all means whether legal or otherwise to have it entirely suppressed".

Had Toleration of the English Service been the only issue at stake in the divided ecclesiastical scene in Scotland there is no doubt that Archbishop Sharp would have been an even more vigorous and determined protagonist for the cause of Scottish Episcopacy than he was, but the use of the English Liturgy was not the only issue. Sharp found that the refusal of the Episcopal

³⁷Ibid., p. 233, L.B.S. MSS, Box 3, Bundle M. 4.

³⁸Ibid., p. 284, L.B.S. MSS, Box 3, Bundle, M. 10.

³⁹Ibid., p. 284, L.B.S. MSS, Box 3, Bundle, M. 13.

party to take the Oaths to Government prevented any more strenuous or direct action on their behalf.

Short of Revolution it was too late to re-establish Episcopacy in Scotland. High Churchman and Tory though he was Sharp was not a Revolutionary in the cause of Jacobitism. There was a great deal he could still do, however, to encourage his friends in Scotland, and to embarrass the Presbyterians. From private sources he raised funds to keep them alive; even securing for some of the Bishops, namely, Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Glasgow, pensions from Queen Anne. In every issue through which the cause of Episcopacy could be advanced, such as the Union and the Toleration he used what influence he had with the Government.

It appears that Sharp was the most sympathetic of the English Bishops from the Scottish Episcopal point of view. He never raises with them the awkward question of their Jacobitism. Either he accepts it, knowing that there is little he can do for them if he were to raise this issue, and does what he can for them for reasons which he himself holds in good conscience. Or else he is quite willing to allow them their Jacobitism, believing that it would never spread beyond its national barriers, and would remain a constant thorn in the flesh of the Presbyterians.

BISHOP COMPTON'S AWKWARD QUESTION

If Sharp was prepared to indulge in this kind of political risk neither Tenison nor Compton were ready to do so.

Henry Compton,⁴⁰ Bishop of London, also received letters

⁴⁰ Carpenter, E.F., The Protestant Bishop: The Life of Henry Compton Bishop of London, p. 307-309.

from Scotland imploring his help. James Gordon⁴¹ of Foveran, George Dunbar⁴² of Haddington, James Hay of Gogar, all outed Episcopal ministers, were among his correspondents. Some took the road to London to escape from a Scotland that no longer could offer them congenial employment. To some of these exiled Scottish Episcopalians⁴³ he offered appointments in Virginia, to others he gave livings in England. One, at least, went over to Amsterdam and served the English congregation there for sixteen years before returning to a parish in Middlesex. Nor was Compton laggard in raising funds by public subscription and by parish collections⁴⁴ to be sent to the aid of the Episcopalians in Scotland. Compton, however, was prepared to ask the awkward question, the crucial question, the question about where their loyalty lay.

As long as the exiled King was alive this was, perhaps, a delicate question, and one which involved personal Oaths. By 1703, however, the King across the water was dead. Queen Anne was Sovereign. It was now time that the Scottish Bishops were sounded on this vital matter.

⁴¹Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MSS, 985, No. 26. Account of James Gordon's maltreatment at the hands of the Presbyterians in Scotland.

⁴²Ibid., No. 45, Dunbar to Compton, 8th December, 1702.

⁴³Ibid., No. 30. List of Scots Clergy at present in London. This List includes Mr. Gadderar, Dr. Munro, Mr. Strachan and Mr. Lauder of Whitekirk, near the Bass, east of Edinburgh.

⁴⁴Ibid., No. 28. Collections for Distressed Scots Clergy, March 19th, 1693-November 19th, 1694.

On 15th October, 1702, Archbishop Paterson⁴⁵ of Glasgow wrote to Compton suggesting that he, together with a certain number of his colleagues, would be prepared to accept a Toleration, similar to the Indulgence granted to the Presbyterians by Charles II, on the basis of loyalty to the Queen. This was indeed a major departure from the position previously held by the Scottish Bishops.

After William's death they had met and discussed whether they might send a Petition to Queen Anne, but they had been unable to reach a common mind on this sensitive subject. According to Bishop Rose's letter to Compton on these matters it had been decided that the time was not ripe.⁴⁶

Now the Archbishop of Glasgow was ready to draw up an Address to the Throne on his own initiative and circulate it among his own clergy. His intention was to present this Petition to the Queen in person, and, thereby, advance the cause, at least, of the loyal Episcopal clergy in Scotland.

This Address by the Archbishop of Glasgow was opposed with great fury and bitterness by the Bishops of Edinburgh and St. Andrews. Rose wrote a letter to Compton full of anger about this move of the Archbishop of Glasgow behind their backs. "This is sham stuff", he writes, "invented to serve his own purposes".⁴⁷

One must have some sympathy with the Bishop of Edinburgh over

⁴⁵Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MS8, 985, No. 43. Letter from Archbishop Paterson to Bishop Compton, 15th October, 1702.

⁴⁶Ibid., No. 51. Letter from Bishop Rose to Bishop Compton, 12th January, 1703

⁴⁷Ibid., Nos. 47 and 53. Letters from Bishop Rose about the Archbishop of Glasgow's Address to the Queen.

this subversive action by Paterson. Not least, because Paterson appears always to have had a ready facility for exploiting situations to his own financial advantage.

Paterson's view, however, was that the death of William had so altered things that "he wondered that now all parties did not come in without scruple to own and serve the Church".⁴⁸ The Archbishop of Glasgow was prepared to take the Oaths to Government. This no Scottish Bishop had so far been prepared to do. Sooner or later, then, the awkward question must be put to the Bishop of Edinburgh in plain terms.

Indeed, the Archbishop of Glasgow forced Compton's hand somewhat by writing to him in March 1703 in the following terms: "Let your Lordships be pleased to write to them (the Bishops of Edinburgh and St. Andrews) desiring to know that supposing her Majesty should find ways to recognise Episcopacy in Scotland, whether in that case they are clear and free to own her title and to give their allegiance to her; and to desire a plain and categorical answer from them to that question".⁴⁹

If it were possible for a united Petition to be sent up to the new Queen from the Scottish Episcopalians their own cause would be strengthened immeasurably. The help that would thereafter flow North from their fellow Episcopalians in England would be without limit. With the accession of Anne a crisis had been

⁴⁸ Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MSS, 935. No. 49. Archbishop Paterson's letter to Bishop Compton, 26th January, 1703

⁴⁹ Ibid., No. 55. Archbishop Paterson's Letter to Bishop Compton, 8th March 1703.

reached in Anglo Scottish ecclesiastical relationships. The Bishop of Edinburgh's party must be made to declare itself. On 6th April, therefore, Compton sent a letter to Scotland asking the awkward question. Were the Bishops of Edinburgh and St. Andrews ready to take the Oaths to Queen Anne or were they not?

Faced with this direct question Bishop Rose⁵⁰ sent a reply admitting that they could not take the Oaths to the Queen without reservation. He says that he has always regarded himself "as bound in point of prudence to avoid the making any discovery of my thoughts upon that subject", but since Compton had assured him that his reply would not "operate any manner of way to my prejudice" he was prepared to give his answer.

The Address of the loyal Episcopalians had to go forward to the Queen, therefore, in the name of the Archbishop of Glasgow alone. A loyal and united Episcopal party, strongly supported by the English Bishops, might have limited very severely the Presbyterian influence in Scotland to such an extent that during Anne's reign the virtual establishment of the Episcopalians North of the Tay might have been achieved. The declared and unbreakable Jacobitism of the dominant party without Scottish Episcopalianism, headed by Bishop Rose, prevented this ever taking place.

Rose looked for a better future than merely to share Scotland with the Presbyterians. He hoped for Restoration and the Return of the exiled Monarchy. In April, 1703, he wrote to Compton:⁵¹

⁵⁰ Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MSS, 98E. No. 58. Bishop Rose's letter to Bishop Compton, 24th April, 1703.

⁵¹ Ibid., No. 57. Bishop Rose's letter to Bishop Compton, 15th April, 1703.

"A little countenance and assistance to the Episcopal interest in Scotland would serve to reestablish Episcopacy if our State Ministers were true and hearty friends to it. Time and just consideration will, I trust, at length deliver us and set the Church again upon its ancient foot for the true interest of Religion and our ancient Monarchy, but trimming, faint and timorous measures and proceedings will never do it".

During these same years Bishop Rose was engaged, also in a correspondence with St. Germain. Whether Tenison and Compton knew about these letters we do not know, but surely they must have suspected it. "The Correspondence of Colonel Hooke, the Agent from the Court of France to the Scottish Jacobites in the years 1703 - 1707", contains ample evidence about the hopes of the Bishop for an invasion of Scotland with French aid, and his advice about the religious settlement of Scotland after the devoutly hoped for Restoration of the Royal House.⁵²

THE BISHOP OF EDINBURGH'S LONDON AGENT

Bishop Rose had, however, a regular and more sympathetic correspondent in London than Compton, Mr. Archibald Campbell,⁵³

⁵²The Correspondence of Colonel Hooke, Vol. I, p. 222 No. 105. Queen's letter to Mr. Digby, i.e. Bishop of Edinburgh, June 25th, 1705; p. 292, No. 106. Bishop of Edinburgh's letter to the Queen, August 23rd 1705. Signed Sybilla More by Queen's instructions: Also letters dated June 20th and September 3rd, 1704; Vol. 2, p. 31, No. 20. Mr. Fleming's English Memoirs.

⁵³Episcopal Chest, M38, Edinburgh, MS. No. 1804. Letter from Bishop Rose to Mr. Campbell, April 20th, 1707.

"a near cousin to the Duke of Argyle", later to become a Bishop, the main link between the Scottish Episcopalians and the English Non Jurors. Much of the correspondence which passed between Rose and Campbell has to do with liturgical and doctrinal matters that were of great interest to both the Non Jurors and the Scottish Episcopalians, but the letters, also, give us a most valuable account of the day to day affairs of the Afflicted Church, and the way in which Rose wished its affairs to be presented in England.

Rose, for instance, is always anxious that English opinion should be well informed about the persecutions which the Episcopalians had to suffer at Presbyterian hands.

In April, 1706, he writes to Campbell⁵⁴ telling him of the closure of Meeting Houses at St. Andrews, Keith and Elgin, and that "Council letters have been issued out for summoning the preachers at the Meeting Houses of St. Johnstone, Dundee, Montrose and St. Ninians beside Stirling". "God knows", he says, "where this will end, unless our statesmen above or some others interpose not to put some stop to this persecution". "There is a plain design to root out and destroy in this nation the Episcopal interest".

He tells Campbell that he intends to write to all the statesmen who might be sympathetic to their case. He has already written to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of York and London along similar lines. "I know not", he says, "in what condition they are to offer relief, however 'tis not amiss to let them know our case and to crave their assistance".

⁵⁴Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh, MS. No. 1801. Letter from Bishop Rose to Mr. Campbell, April 20th 1706.

He is anxious, too, about financial matters. He would like to be supported by a gift out of the Bishop's Rents. This, indeed, is a constant topic in all Rose's letters to Canterbury, York and London;⁵⁵ but such are his scruples about admitting the Queen's title that he asks Campbell to ensure that the Narrative bequeathing such a gift be so worded that in so vital a matter this point does not offend his conscience. He pleads not for himself alone. He wishes Campbell to try to obtain a gift of twenty-five pounds out of the Bishop's rents for poor, old Bishop Sage. He is aware that this matter cannot be carried through openly, "when the Presbyterians are so high and so much caressed to make them tractable to the intended Union"; but he suggests that approach might be made to the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London asking them to put Sage's case before the Queen: namely, "that there is such a good man who has written learnedly in defence of Episcopacy, and wants much to be supported".

He wishes Campbell, also, to see that as much public notice is given to the sufferings of the Episcopal clergy in Scotland as is possible; and reminds him to stress the increase that is taking place in the use of the English Liturgy at the Episcopal Meeting Houses.

⁵⁵ Bodleian Library, Oxford, Rawlinson MSS 985. No. 60 Letter from Bishop Rose to Bishop Compton on Bishops Rents, July 20th, 1703; Also Nos. 72 and 76; No. 78, dated February 22nd, 1706 thanks Compton for securing him a Pension.

In January, 1708, he writes to Campbell⁵⁶ suggesting that he pass on bits and pieces of gossip and tittle-tattle which were not likely to do any good to the cause of the Presbyterians in Scotland. At the last Fast Day, he reports that the Presbyterian ministers had preached against the Union and against the Idolatry of the Church of England. It was said: "The great sin they should mourn for was the breaking and not renewing the Covenant". Such snippets would be much relished by Campbell and his friends, and they would have little trouble in passing them about.

His most damaging piece of gossip, however, is from a sermon by Mr. John Williamson, of Inverness, in which the minister had been rash enough to say that the Queen had been educated in an idolatrous Church, and had never yet given evidence of her repentance, and so should not be trusted. There is no doubt that this is the kind of extravagance that was hurled from the pulpits of parish Kirks by fiery Presbyterian preachers. Generally throughout the Church there was distrust of the Queen. There was a longing to leave the quicksands of political intrigue and uncertainty in which the Church found itself and to strike out for the firm bedrock of the Covenant. But the Presbyterians could not go back. The days of the Covenant were gone for ever. It was self delusion to believe they could return. Rose and his agents would do their best to make sure that their ecclesiastical enemies faced an uncertain establishment. By skilful whisper and

⁵⁶Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh. MS. No. 1806. Letter from Bishop Rose to Mr. Campbell, January 20th, 1708.

political pressure those fears could be played upon. A great deal might be achieved with English help: much more than merely grants from the Bishops' Rents.

In 1710, Rose wrote to Campbell⁵⁷ with a request for more Service Books. He had just returned from a tour through "the country" and found that there was "a disposition for setting up the English Service Book in some new places"; and that "where it was used the numbers of those who frequent it are daily increasing".

He has, also, something to say about the Greenshields case. He expressed considerable concern about its outcome. Towards Greenshields himself he displays a certain amount of coldness. He warns Campbell⁵⁸ not to accept everything that Greenshields says, especially about his relationship to "the Bishop of Edinburgh", without direct enquiry. James Greenshields⁵⁹ had been ordained by Ramsay, Bishop of Ross, after his deprivation. He had gone to Ireland from Scotland but had returned to Edinburgh, taken the Oaths to Government, and set up a Meeting House where the English Liturgy was used. In this he sought the protection of the Courts, and against the sentence of the Scottish Courts he appealed to the House of Lords; thus making legal history.

⁵⁷Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh, MS. No. 1814. Letter from Bishop Rose to Mr. Campbell, October 10th 1710.

⁵⁸Ibid., MS. No. 1815. Letter from Bishop Rose to Mr. Campbell, November 2nd 1710.

⁵⁹Domestic Annals of Scotland, Reign of Queen Anne, p. 350-355, Greenshields Case: Lord Advocates of Scotland, G.W.T. Omond, p. 286; Fountainhalls Decisions, Vol. II, p. 523, 549; History of Scotland, Hill Burton, Vol. II, p. 35-38.

While he was in Edinburgh he had no licence from the Bishop of Edinburgh to minister in his Diocese. For this there was good reason. In the Wake MSS there is an "Account of Greenshields' Ordination"⁶⁰ in which it is made clear that at his ordination Greenshields had taken the Oath "to the same King for whom the Bishop (Rose) professed to suffer". As witnesses to this there are cited Mr. William Smart and Mr. Robert Calder who had both been present at his ordination. Greenshields' apostasy, therefore, was hardly likely to win approval from Rose. When Greenshields' appeal, however, to the House of Lords was successful Rose wrote to Campbell in the most enthusiastic terms: "This is the first and only victory since the Revolution we have had over our enemies", he says, "I pray God it may prove a prologue to a total overthrow. I know that you laboured not a little for it, for which I humbly thank God, as I have not been a little uneasy for the fate of it and the fatal consequences which must needs have attended a miscarriage. God be blessed that the matter is far otherwise".⁶¹

That Rose was not alone in his fears about the clamour for Toleration which the Greenshields case had brought to a head is evident from one of Bishop Sage's letters to Campbell.⁶² In

⁶⁰ Christ Church Library, Oxford, Wake, MSS, Vol. XIX Unnumbered and unpagged MS on Scottish Affairs dated 1711.

⁶¹ Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, MS. No. 1817. Letter from Bishop Rose to Mr. Campbell, March 8th, 1711.

⁶² Ibid., No. 1980. Letter from Bishop Sage to Mr. Campbell, November 18th, 1710.

November 1710, he wrote a most careful account of the disadvantages which a legal Toleration was bound to bring with it to those who could not take the Oaths to Government. "None knows better", he says, "than his Lordship Balmerino, that we do not need a Toleration. No law obliges us to be of the Presbyterian communion, no law forbids meeting houses, nay, no law obliges those who officiate in meeting houses to qualify. There was indeed one made in 1693 but it expired with King William, and was never renewed in this reign. All therefore that we want is an equitable connivance, and that we should be allowed to enjoy what the law allows us, at least till we turn insolent and offer trouble to the Government. Let our judges here be directed by their Sovereign not to meddle with us, and then we have all that we can reasonably demand".

Toleration, he argues, will only make us "the prisoner of the Government", and alarm "the dominant Kirk". He hopes that those like Mr. Greenshields, who press for Toleration, may think on the "destructive consequences of it", and "may not continue to press it", for thereby they may find themselves left "as the sole masters of all the beneficial meeting houses, others of a narrower swallow being incapacitated by the cloggs" - the cloggs being the Oaths of Loyalty.

In April, 1712, Rose reports to Campbell fresh outbursts against the Liturgy.⁶³ He is not so concerned, however, about local matters of this kind which he thinks local Episcopalian

⁶³Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh, MS. No. 1829. Letter from Bishop Rose to Mr. Campbell, April 3rd, 1712.

Lairds can deal with. He is more concerned with the Government's demand that all preachers, Presbyterian and Episcopalian must take the Oath of Abjuration. Some Episcopalians obviously thought that the Presbyterians would not comply with this demand, and that they would escape "through the non compliance of the Presbyterians". But Rose says that he presumes the Presbyterians will comply: "And in that case I see not how the other can escape". He continues: "We are talking here of our having to be provided with curates from you in case of the obstinacie of our own". Yet this would offer no real solution to the problem, since they would be "as little acceptable to our people as the others". No man who had qualified or had been ordained in England and then come North was in any way acceptable to the Scottish Jacobite Episcopalianism which Rose represented.

Restoration and the Return of the exiled Monarchy are never far from Rose's thoughts or prayers and the odd reference to the fulfilment of his dreams creeps into his letters. "We are expecting great news from you", he says at the end of his letter, dated April 26th, 1712: "I hope when anything occurs you will honour us with an account of it".⁶⁴ What was the great news? Plans for Invasion? Were they on the very threshold of Restoration?

This interesting correspondence between Rose and Campbell ends in September 1715, after the outbreak of the Rebellion when it

⁶⁴ Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh, MS, No. 1830. Letter from Bishop Rose to Mr. Campbell, April 26th, 1712.

became too dangerous for them to continue it. Rose writes:
 "I am sorry that this critical juncture makes an interruption in our correspondence. I am a great loser by it and left ignorant of many things that might be both satisfying and useful for me to know, but I must rest content hoping that the cloud will ere long pass over. I resolve to be a strick observer of the common rule, carefully observed here, and that is to write nothing of news or what may relate to the Government, and therefore this is only to tell you that I heartily agree with you in the thoughts as to my son James (who was out with the Rebels) as you expressed them in your letter to Mr. Littlejohn".⁶⁵

Bishop Rose's letters record, quite properly, the rise and spread of the use of the English Prayer Book among Scottish Episcopalians. It represents a genuine development of interest in Liturgical and Sacramental worship, which previously had little place in Episcopal worship in Scotland, and was entirely absent from the Presbyterian Establishment. It brought upon its head the bitter and uncompromising opposition of the Established Kirk. Presbyterians believed that there was no Scriptural warrant for Prayer Book worship, the Service Book itself was regarded as being a mere translation from the Popish Latin Mass Book: Altars, Crosses, Garments, Gestures, Holy Days, the Five Bastard Sacraments, Prayers for the Dead, Bowing at the Name of Jesus, Kneeling at the Sacrament - all these things were regarded as being examples of

⁶⁵Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh, MS, No. 1835. Letter from Bishop Rose to Mr. Campbell, September 1st, 1715.

Popish idolatry and superstition.⁶⁶ The Presbyterians' hatred of the Prayer Book, however, served the Episcopalians well. It provided them with a reasonable and undeniable ground upon which to appeal to the Established Church in England for support. Behind this facade of Apostolic principle and Liturgical practice, provided the issue was not pressed to too fine a point, the Jacobitism of the Scottish Episcopalians could remain cloaked. It could hope to survive behind a respectable front and wait patiently for its day. But after that day had dawned, and the Jacobitism of the Scottish Episcopalians had been declared irrevocably, the door which had been open to English sympathy, English interest, and English help was firmly shut.

⁶⁶Willison, John, Queries to the Scots Innovators in Divine Service and Particularly to the Liturgical Party in the Shire of Angus (1712), p. 9-27.

CHAPTER 4

UNCERTAINTY UNDER ANNE

While Anne's reign saw redoubled efforts on the part of the Presbyterians to establish ministers of the Established Kirk in the Highlands and Islands, and in all the country North of the Tay, it also witnessed a remarkable resurgence of Episcopalian hopes.

Behind the facade of Liturgical Worship in the Episcopal Meeting Houses the Presbyterians saw the threat of Rome and St. Germain. By means of the Restoration of Patronage, the granting of a legal Toleration, and the division of the Presbyterians over the Abjuration Oath, the Church feared that the Jacobites would gain sufficient power to bring about its destruction.

These were years of uncertainty. During this period it was the aim of Carstairs to hold together a strong and united Church. This he succeeded in doing until the House of Hanover was firmly established upon the Throne.

A True Protestant Queen

Innovations in the Worship of God

Probationers for the Highlands

Branches and Parts of a Hellish Plot

A Licence to Disturb

The Abjuration Crisis

A TRUE PROTESTANT QUEEN

In March, 1702, A Humble Address¹ was sent up to the Queen on her Accession to the Throne from the Ministers and Elders of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. They said: "We desire heartily to bless God for His having set your Majesty a true Protestant Queen, upon the throne to rule over us". They thanked the Queen, also, for the early and full assurance she had given them of her firm resolve to protect all her Scottish subjects in their laws and liberties, in their religion, "and in the Established Government of this Church". They reminded the Queen that their Presbyterianism was very precious to them since it was founded upon the "Word of God", but they assured the Queen that they owned and acknowledged her title to the Crown to be "most undoubtedly lawful and rightful". They promised faithfully to assert and maintain the same to the utmost of their power against all Pretenders whomsoever, and to use their best endeavours with the people committed to their charge, to keep and preserve them in their duty and loyalty to the Crown.

Queen Anne had given the Church in Scotland the constitutional assurances of her protection and support as she was bound to do. In the political upheavals that the Presbyterians feared would take place during her reign, what reliance could be placed in her Royal promises? Under a Tory Government what would become of the still struggling Presbyterian Church?

Gone were the days of William the Deliverer. Anne was a devout Anglican,² regular in her Communion, devoted to her Prayer

¹Acts of Assembly, 1702.

²Stanhope, Reign of Queen Anne, Vol. 1, p. 42; Stoughton, Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges, p. 4.

Book. Her ecclesiastical advisers were High Churchmen like John Sharp, Archbishop of York. During her father's residence at the Palace of Holyroodhouse, it is claimed, she had worshipped in the Episcopal Chapel of Old St. Pauls,³ in the High Street. Above all she was a Princess of the ancient Royal House. She was a Stuart.

She revived the custom of the "Royal Touch".⁴ "Touching for the Evil" became a popular ceremony once again. By those who held to the theory of Divine Right the "Royal Touch" was regarded as a Divine proof of the rightness of her title to the Crown. William could never have possessed such a gift, but Anne who was descended from the Divinely ordered line of Kings was believed to possess it. Her undoubted interest in her fellow Episcopalians in Scotland is shown in her first letter to the General Assembly.⁵ She expresses the hope that the Presbyterians will "carry so with others of the Reformed Protestant Religion, albeit differing from you in forms of Church policy, that by your meekness and charity, they may be the more inclined to live peaceably and dutifully under us, and in brotherly love and respect towards you". She assumes that brotherly affection and co-operation will not be lacking on the part of the Episcopalians, and promises that her Privy Council will "proceed diligently in censure against such delinquents", but adds: "We hope better things of them".

³ Ingram, A Jacobite Stronghold of the Church, p. 6

⁴ Stoughton, Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges, p. 7.

⁵ Acts of Assembly 1703. Queen's Letter, 5th February, 1703.

While the Queen reveals a tolerant and sympathetic attitude towards the Episcopalians she shows no such attitude towards those who are not of the Reformed Protestant Religion, and draws the attention of the General Assembly to the grave dangers of Popish inroads among the remoter "Highlanders and Islanders". She desires that the Assembly will send well qualified ministers to these parishes to combat this menace to her dynasty, and promises that instructions will be given to the Privy Council for "the exact application of our Royal authority and laws to these good ends".

The Assembly⁶ was quite ready to admit the grave dangers that Popery brought with it, and indeed, in its reply to the Queen's letter, draws up a list of its ill effects in Highland life. Mass houses had been set up. Popish schools had been established to poison and corrupt Highland youth. The Queen's laws were being violated and disaffection to her Government was on the increase. This work of sedition could be laid safely at the door of Popery, and was in keeping with the Queen's expressed views of the situation in the Highlands.

The Assembly was less amenable when it came to the Queen's views of the Episcopalians. Here her views met with the strongest opposition. They admitted that it was their duty to live in charity and forbearance towards those who differed from them peaceably, but they complained bitterly that they were not

⁶ Acts of Assembly 1703. Address of the General Assembly to the Queen, 22nd March, 1703.

the destroyers of the peace. The "disorders" about which the Queen had showed her Royal concern were caused by Episcopalian intruders and their abettors, who "have given as little evidence of their affection to your Majesty's Government, as to the Established Church".

They, then, proceed to inform the Queen that they have drawn up a List of such Intrusions, Irregular Baptisings, Clandestine Marriages, Despising of the Sentences of the Privy Council and the Church Judicatories, and several other "Gross Abuses", which they have sent to the Privy Council, with copies to her Majesty's Secretaries of State. They state that they expect action to be taken not only against Papists who break her Majesty's laws, but also against "all unwarrantable and illegal attempts of Dissenters" to disrupt the established Government of the Church, and the peace of the Kingdom. Having declared its mind on Episcopalianism the Assembly set about planting the vacant Churches in the North, sending Ministers and Probationers to the Highlands and Islands, and "promoting Religion and a Knowledge of God" in these places. In 1702, the years following, several Acts⁷ were passed by the General Assembly which reveal the application of strict Church discipline in forcing all available ministerial manpower to serve North of the Tay. Bursaries for students having the Irish language were increased in number, but students who held such bursaries were prohibited thereafter from

⁷ Acts of Assembly, 1703. Act Approving Overtures concerning the Planting of Vacant Churches in the North, the Highlands and Islands, and Supplying them with Ministers and Probationers, and Promoting Religion and a Knowledge of God in these Places, 22nd March, 1703.

serving in Lowland parishes. The work of establishing both Schools⁸ and Libraries⁹ in the Highland areas was pushed forward vigorously. By 1704 the Presbyteries South of the Tay were thought to be "completely planted".¹⁰ One half of the bursaries belonging to the Presbyteries South of the Tay were reallocated to help with the education of young men from the Highlands at the Colleges of Edinburgh, Glasgow and St. Andrews. It was stated, however, that the youths receiving these bursaries must not only be sober, piously inclined, proficient in Latin, and judged in due time to become Ministers of the Gospel or Schoolmasters, but they must be prepared to serve in the Highlands, and they must be well affected to the Government of the Church and the State.

By such measures the Church ensured that students preparing for the ministry of the Established Church were alike trustworthy in both their ecclesiastical and their political orthodoxy.

Entrance to College and scrutiny in College came under the Acts of Assembly. In 1705, the Professors of Theology¹¹ in the Colleges were required to pay particular attention not only to their students' progress in their studies, and to their "pious carriage", but also to their "good affection to the Government of Church and State".

⁸Acts of Assembly, 1704. Act Anent Erecting Schools in the Highlands

⁹Ibid., Act Anent Libraries.

¹⁰Ibid., Act for bestowing Bursaries upon Students having Irish.

¹¹Acts of Assembly, 1705. Act Concerning Schools and Bursaries, and for Instructing Youth in the Principles of Religion, 5th April, 1705; Recommendations Concerning Students of Theology, and Intrants to the Holy Ministry, 11th April, 1705.

In 1706 all schoolmasters¹² within the bounds of Presbyteries had to sign the Confession of Faith, and all public Grammar Schools were required to be visited by representatives of the Presbytery at least twice every year. Good affection to the Government of Church and State, and peaceable principles and disposition were among the essential requirements for official recognition by the Church for anyone aspiring to become a Divinity student, a Probationer, or a Schoolmaster.

By 1705, fifty eight Parochial Libraries had been distributed within the bounds of the Highland Presbyteries.¹³ None of the ministers of Ross and Sutherland¹⁴ were to be allowed to be transported until their numbers were increased, and ministers and probationers were to be sent to these Presbyteries.

In 1706, five Probationers were sent to be settled by the Presbyteries of Dundee and Forfar. These Presbyteries were instructed to send up to the Lord Advocate accounts of the "irregularities and disorders of the Episcopal clergy" within their bounds, and to seek his assistance and advice to help them obtain legal redress for their grievances.¹⁵

Many of the Highland parishes were far too large geographically to be adequately ministered to by one man. In 1707, the Assembly sent Probationers into these parishes to provide an itinerant

¹² Acts of Assembly, 1706. Recommendations and Act concerning Schoolmasters, and Schools and Bursaries, 13th April, 1706.

¹³ Acts of Assembly, 1705. Act Concerning Libraries for the Highlands, etc.

¹⁴ Ibid., Index to Acts.

¹⁵ Acts of Assembly, 1706. Index to Acts

ministry among the people. Probationers, too, were specially trained in the "Popish contraversies" and sent into the Highland parishes to instruct the people in the principles of the true Reformed Protestant Religion. Again, Probationers were made use of who had no Irish. It was their task to preach "the half of the day in which the minister useth to preach in English".¹⁶

During this period the Letters from the Assembly to the Queen convey a full account of all measures taken to combat the menace of Popery in the North. Nor does the Assembly fail to record its view of the difficulties which a disaffected and disorderly Episcopal party put in its way. Lest, however, the Queen be in any doubt as to the Assembly's loyalty to her Majesty the Assembly is constant in the unequivocal declaration of its convictions. Their prayer is that God will long preserve the Queen for the good of all her people, and "the maintaining of the True Protestant Religion". They pray that God will prosper her arms against all her enemies, especially "that grand Enemy both of Religion and Righteousness, who supports an Usurper against your Majesty, and would impose upon us a Popish successor, to the subversion of our Holy Religion, and the ruin of this Ancient Kingdom".¹⁷ They assure the Queen of their earnest and constant prayer that a Protestant may always sit upon the Throne.

¹⁶ Acts of Assembly, 1707. Act for Suppressing of Popery, 14th April, 1707.

¹⁷ Acts of Assembly, 1705. Assembly's Letter to the Queen.

INNOVATIONS IN THE WORSHIP OF GOD

In 1707, the Assembly passed an "Act Against Innovations in the Worship of God".¹⁸ This Act had as its aim the suppression of the Prayer Book in Scotland, and as such was a direct attack against the rise and spread of Liturgical worship, which had taken place in the early years of Anne's reign. This Act sought to preserve the purity of Presbyterian worship in Scotland, and to give the Church the right to suppress Liturgical worship in any parish in the land.

Why should the Church have thought it necessary?

It could be said that this Act was an attempt to prevent English influence creeping into Scottish life. The Union had meant the transference of the centre of a great deal of Scottish political and social life from Edinburgh to London. Scottish subjects who moved South were bound to be influenced by English ways, even by the Prayer Book worship of the Church of England. Conservative opinion in Scotland was very critical of these influences. Wodrow,¹⁹ for instance, complains of "ruling elders" habitually haunting the worship of the Church of England when in London.

If "Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed" and similar pamphlets are to be believed, then, the standards of public worship in Scotland had sunk to a most undignified and slovenly level. Macaulay,²⁰ however, suggests that such productions were

¹⁸ Acts of Assembly, 1707. Act Against Innovations in the Worship of God.

¹⁹ Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 357

²⁰ Macaulay, History of England, Vol. 5. p. 338.

merely "jest books", bespattered with extreme samples of coarseness and rhetoric, designed chiefly for the consumption of High Church Tory squires and their friends. They were not to be taken as an accurate standard of the public worship of the Church of Scotland.

Presbyterian Scotland, however, had little real acquaintance with Prayer Book worship.²¹ It is not to be wondered at that even ruling elders who went to London showed a natural interest and appreciation of a form of worship different from their own.

The Assembly had, of course, sound theological reasons for its opposition to the English Liturgy. The Prayer Book was "manifestly contrary to our known principle, which is, that nothing is to be admitted in the worship of God, but what is prescribed in the Holy Scriptures". It was claimed that the Prayer Book had never been used during the late Prelacy; that it was against the "good and laudable laws made since the late happy Revolution"; and that such an innovation was against the "doctrine, worship, discipline and government" of the Church as established by law. All these were weighty considerations in the minds of Presbyterians, but, in addition, there was an even more weighty consideration. The Act claims that the promoters of this Liturgical worship are "persons of known disaffection to the present Establishment, both of Church and State". This was

²¹ Scottish Church History Society Records. McMillan, W. The Anglican Book of Common Prayer in the Church of Scotland, (Vol. 4 1932); Macrae, J.E., The Liturgy of Scottish Non Jurors, Vol. 10, 1950.

"Jacobitism in disguise", to use Bishop Dowden's²² phrase.

It can hardly be expected, therefore, that the Presbyterians would be interested in the advantages of Liturgical worship as such or in a freedom to worship in the way one considered to be best, when the Party promoting these conceptions, if it ever gained power, would have effectively destroyed the rule of law and the religious liberty which they believed had been gained for Scotland at the Revolution.

It may be argued that this was far from the intentions of the Episcopalians. They might be Jacobite, but they constantly and strenuously repudiated the assertion that they were Romanists. Nevertheless, this was the fear in Presbyterian minds. Whatever might or might not have been the consequences of a Jacobite triumph in Scotland, the feared consequences were real and powerful and determinative.

The 1707 Act appears, however, to have been largely ignored. Apart from recording the mind of the Church on these matters, it did nothing to stop the spread of Liturgical worship in the Episcopal Meeting Houses throughout the parishes of Scotland. In 1709, Wodrow²³ writes, angrily: "The English Service is setting up very busily in the North, at Inverness, Elgin, Aberdeen, Montrose, and many other places, to the great grief of many of our

²² Dowden, John, Scottish Communion Office of 1764, p. 45

²³ Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. 1. Letter XIII. Wodrow to McCracken, 24th August, 1709.

brethren there, and the weakening or rather ruining of our discipline". The Commission of Assembly meeting in Edinburgh at the beginning of August that year had petitions addressed to it against the Innovations from Edinburgh and other places.

Wodrow has more to say on the same theme in a letter to the Rev. James Guthrie of Irongray.²⁴ He recounts the dismal news of the day, the attempts of the Episcopal clergy to present an Address for Toleration, the lamentable spread of their Meeting Houses in Angus, their "burying of the dead with the Liturgy and the clergy in their habits", the fact that "the nobility and gentry are very fond of these new fashions", and his fear that "no redress is like to be got at Court". "I am persuaded", he says, "(if God's providence prevent it not) the Court ... will come to feel the effects of this Jacobite and French faction, that set up for these innovations from no strait of conscience, but merely to embroil the country, and alienate peoples affections from the present establishment, if they dont notice it in time".

A grim reminder of how near and real the enemy might be occurred in 1708. In that year a French fleet under the Chevalier de St. George appeared off the coast of Scotland. The Union had not been popular in Scotland. There lurked in Scottish minds a fear of English domination. The laxity of Anne's Tory ministers towards the Scottish Jacobite-Episcopalians had encouraged their aspirations. Certain elements in Scottish life might have been ready to welcome the Pretender. Invasion

²⁴ Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. 1. Letter XXIII, p. 77 and Letter XXIV, p. 79. Rev. Hugh Maxwell, Minister of Tealing, nr. Dundee, to Wodrow, on "Effects of the Gentry to introduce the English Litur in the North".

of Scotland at this juncture might have met with success.

The French king produced ships and men, the Pope contributed money, and ordered prayers to be said for the success of the undertaking in English, Irish and Scottish Churches. Indulgences were to be granted to all who would join in offering them up. By such means Popery was to be restored in Britain. This was exactly what Wodrow and his fellow Presbyterians feared.²⁵

The defeat of the Chevalier's Invasion force brought forth two strongly worded Addresses from the Assembly. In reply to the Queen's Letter which had thanked the Assembly for the affection and loyalty which had been shown by the ministers of the Established Church during the recent threat of Invasion, the Assembly²⁶ assured the Queen again that it was their duty, "and their plain and visible interest to oppose and witness against an attempt so injurious to your Majesty, and your Royal Crown and Dignity, and so destructive to our peace, and our religion and liberties".

This was followed a few days later by an even more forcefully worded, "Most Humble, Faithful and Dutiful Address to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty"²⁷ in which they again repeat their abhorrence at the bold and mischievous attempt made by the French Monarch to invade Britain and place a Popish Usurper on the throne and declare their unshakable loyalty to the Queen and the Protestant Succession, in the following terms:- "Whatever encouragement, Madam, that French and Popish enemy might have had from this part

²⁵Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 47. Footnote and Letter XXIII, p. 77.

²⁶Acts of Assembly, 1708. Assembly's Answer to the Queen's Letter, 1708

²⁷Ibid., Humble, Faithful and Most Dutiful Address to the Queen, 23rd April, 1708.

of Britain, or elsewhere; we for our part cheerfully embrace this opportunity of declaring to the world, that all the Communion of this Church are so sensible of the blessings that by the Divine favour they enjoy, under the Government of your Majesty, their only rightful and lawful Sovereign, and of the many advantages of the late happy Revolution, of which the settling of the Crown upon your Majesty and Protestant Successors, is none of the least; They have so great a concern for the Protestant interest, and such an abhorrence of Popery and Tyranny, and know so well the many dismal and lamentable instances of French government, that they have an equal detestation of the Counsels of Versailles, and the Pretensions of St. Germain's". A Solemn National Thanksgiving was duly ordered by the Assembly for their "surprizing deliverance" from the Pretender's invasion.²⁸

PROBATIONERS FOR THE HIGHLANDS

If the Assembly required a spur to continue their efforts to fill the vacant parishes in the North the threatened invasion reminded them vividly that they must use every effort to secure an established ministry in the Highlands with kirks, mansees, glebes and legal stipends as soon as possible. In 1709, the supply of Probationers for the Highland parishes²⁹ was again reviewed. An Act was passed dealing with Probationers who had lived in the Highlands in childhood, or had spoken the Irish language in

²⁸ Acts of Assembly, 1708. Act Concerning a Solemn Thanksgiving, 24th April, 1708.

²⁹ Acts of Assembly, 1709. Act Concerning Planting the Highlands, and Probationers having the Irish Language, 18th April, 1709.

childhood. The Assembly ordained that Presbyteries, before they take men on trial who had lived in the Highlands, but no longer did so, were to write to the Highland Presbytery concerned and find out if the young man either had the Irish language or might be expected to acquire it in a short time. If a favourable reply were received the Probationer was to be sent to supply in the Highlands.

By 1710, it appears that the supply of Probationers for the Lowland Presbyteries has ceased to present any problem. It is significant, therefore, that with an adequate supply of candidates to fill Lowland vacancies the Assembly lays down certain specific requirements for students before they may be admitted to trials for licence. Six years of previous study is laid down as an essential minimum but Highland students were to be exempt from these demands: "this shall not be extended to students having the Irish language".³⁰

In 1712, we find the Assembly still looking for ways and means to encourage students having the Irish language to enter the Colleges and prepare themselves for a ministry in the North. It was decided that ten pounds at least should be paid to each bursar, and that small bursaries should be joined together to make up this sum.³¹

There is little doubt from the evidence of the Acts of Assembly

³⁰ Acts of Assembly, 1710. Overtures Anent Trying and Licensing Probationers for the Holy Ministry, 2nd May, 1710.

³¹ Acts of Assembly, 1712. Act for the Farther Encouragement of Students having Irish, 13th May, 1712.

and the Presbytery Records for this period that the Church used all its agencies to secure the North against Popish and Jacobite influence. For this work, however, the Church drew upon powerful outside help, especially upon the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge.³² This Society, which was to do so much to provide schools and schoolmasters for Highland parishes, owed its inception, strangely enough, to an "outed" Episcopal minister, James Kirkwood.³³ While Chaplain to the Breadalbane family he had become familiar with the needs of the Highlands, and, in 1702, he was appointed corresponding member in Scotland for the Society. The Society came under Royal Patronage in 1709, and its subsequent appeals for funds met with immediate and substantial response.

In order to assist the Society the Assembly passed an Act in 1710 recommending the Highland Synods to prepare what amounted to a statistical account of their parishes. The Act reads: "And that the Society may know better how to employ the interest of their stock, when the same comes in: the General Assembly does hereby recommend to the several Synods concerned in the Highlands and Islands, to inquire what parishes in their bounds do want schools, what parishes do need more schools than one, and how many

³² Acts of Assembly, 1710. Representation of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, with an Act and Recommendation thereupon.

³³ SPCK. An Account, 1720. Maclean, D, The Counter Reformation in Scotland, 1560-1930, p. 203; Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness, Vol. XXXI; The Life and Literary Labours of the Rev. Robert Kirk of Aberfoyle, D. Maclean; Vol. XXXI. Highland Libraries in the 18th Century, D. Maclean.

they need, what is the extent of these parishes in length and breadth? As also what ministers have more Churches or places of worship than one? and whether these Churches do stand in different Islands or not? And if there be a school for every Kirk or Island, or any Catechists? As also in what places Popery abounds most? And where Catechists will be needful? and the Assembly appoints Synods to send an impartial and true account of the above particulars to the Secretary of the said Society, subscribed by their Moderator and Clerk as soon as they can, and at furthest betwixt the first day of April 1711".

The information the Assembly asked for was readily forwarded to the Society. In 1711, the Society was able to inform the Assembly that it possessed sufficient resources to set up eleven Charity Schools in the following places:- "One in Abertarff, one in Castletown of Braemar, a third in Auchintool, both in the Highlands of the Shire of Aberdeen, a fourth in the parish of Lairg in Sutherland, a fifth in the parish of Duirness in the county of Strathnayer, a sixth in Elrick in the Presbytery of Skye, a seventh in his Grace the Duke of Atholl's Highlands, an eighth in Glenelg..." Apart from one school for the North Isles, and one for Zetland, all the Charity Schools were placed in parishes where Popery and disaffection to the Government were strongest. The Society claimed to have found sufficient well qualified young men to teach in these schools; and hoped soon to be in a position to settle Charity schools in Assint, Gairloch,

Glenlivet, Inveravon, and "other remote places that most need their assistance".³⁴

So the work of the Charity Schools was begun in Scotland. No Society did more to prevent the spread of Popery and Disaffection than the S.P.C.K. This important and vital work was carried on in the Highland parishes until well after the Rebellion of 1745, and its contribution to the ultimate settlement of the Highlands cannot be over emphasized.

Until the outbreak of the 1715 Rebellion the Assembly continued to consolidate steadily the position of the Established Church in the Highlands by all means open to it. Presbyteries, for instance, are regularly reminded that they must pay their contributions without delay to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.³⁵ Two hundred merks yearly is allowed to the Catechist assisting the minister in Glenlivet.³⁶ The spread of Popery in Lochaber was enquired into by the Commission of Assembly. Probationers were sent to Ross and Sutherland to supply vacancies in the expectation that within six months they would be called to charges there.

In 1714, the S.P.C.K.³⁷ reported to the Assembly that seventeen Charity Schools had been established in the Highlands; and Bibles,

³⁴Acts of Assembly, 1712. Letter from S.P.C.K., 7th May 1712.

³⁵Ibid., Reminders to pay Subscriptions, Index.

³⁶Acts of Assembly, 1713. Case of Catechist for Glenlivet, Lochaber, Sutherland, information in Index.

³⁷Acts of Assembly, 1714. Recommendations in favour of S.P.C.K. 17th May, 1714.

the Confession of Faith, and Larger and Shorter Catechisms were being provided for scholars at the Society's expense. It was also reported that the Charity schoolmasters, in large parishes where there was more than one Kirk, were holding Services for their scholars and such others as were pleased to attend on the Lord's Day, where previously the Lord's Day had been little regarded.

Nor was the supervision of the Universities forgotten. Presbyteries were reminded that they must see that the Masters at Colleges and Universities within their bounds "profess and subscribe in manner appointed by the Sixth Act of the Parliament 1707". This was an Act for securing the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Government. They were enjoined to take special notice of what was being taught in the Colleges and Universities, and must ensure that nothing was taught that was contrary to or inconsistent with the Confession of Faith of the Church, its worship, discipline or Government.³⁸

The Assembly also passed an Act setting out the questions that had to be put to a minister at his Ordination or Induction to a parish.³⁹ These questions have remained in force without alteration until the present day. This Act made sure that all ministers and probationers subscribed a more stringent and detailed formula than had been fixed by Act of Parliament. By this Act the Assembly asserted its right to alter what was laid down by Parliament, but more immediately its purpose was precautionary.

³⁸ Acts of Assembly, 1711. An Act Concerning the Inspection of Universities and Colleges, 23rd May, 1711.

³⁹ Ibid., Act Concerning Questions to be put to Ministers and Probationers, and Engagements to be taken of them. 22nd May, 1711.

It was afraid of what might result from the passing of the Toleration and Patronage Acts, and intended to prevent the admission to parishes under Jacobite patronage of Episcopalian or other disaffected ministers.

BRANCHES AND PARTS OF A HELLISH PLOT

While the Assembly was engaged in settling the Highlands with ministers and schoolmasters the Church had to withstand several Acts of Parliament passed by Anne's Tory ministers, which were vastly repugnant to the Presbyterians. They viewed them as attacks by her enemies against the peace and unity of the Church. They saw in them the designs of the Jacobites to split the Established Church into discontented and bickering factions, and thus weaken her disastrously. It is to the immense credit of William Carstares that during these years, by his wise statesmanship, he was able to hold the Church together and preserve her unity. Wodrow's Letters provide us with the view of a typical conservative Presbyterian Churchman of the time on the issues and personalities of those uncertain years. On 29th October, 1714, he wrote a lengthy review of the events of Anne's reign to his friend, Mr. Thomas Lining, at London. "It is very plain", he says, "that of late several shocks have been given to this Church, and palpable invasions made upon her just rights, contrary to stipulated securities, and that all these have been branches and under parts of the hellish plot of Jacobitism for defeating the Protestant succession, and reducing these lands to

Popery and slavery".⁴⁰ He enumerates the dangers that have resulted to the Church from The Toleration Act; the Imposition upon ministers of the Oath of Abjuration; the Act Restoring Patronages; the Introducing of a foreign worship, the English Liturgy into Scotland; the Union, "a universal grievance to the nation"; the proposal that the Episcopal clergy should be maintained out of the Bishops Rents; and, the Restoring of the Yule Vacance.

All these schemes, he is sure, "were hatched and promoted by illaffected persons or Jacobites, sent from among ourselves, for no other reason but merely out of wantonness, to kick at our constitution, at the Revolution, and at the glorious reign of King William our deliverer".

Wodrow's hand, of course, was not on the helm of the ship. He was only a member of the crew. He had the most profound admiration for, and confidence in, the helmsman, William Carstares: but he did not possess the qualities of mind and spirit which held Carstares to his task. He represents the crew, subjected to rumour, and fears, and buffetings, aware only that the sea is running against them, that the winds are making havoc of the course they had plotted. Angry at the enemy, growing ever more angry and reckless, because they were in great measure unable to strike back, and becoming more frightened that their ship would founder before the storm finally was over.

⁴⁰Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. 1, Letter CLXXVIII, Private Memorial to Mr. Robert Lining, at London 29th October, 1714, p. 593.

Wodrow's fear of what the Jacobites might do was real enough; and it is reflected in the Letters, Pamphlets, and Acts of Assembly of the time.

There is no doubt that the extreme Presbyterians regarded the Union as an act of national apostacy. It was a denial of the Solemn League and Covenant. It must be opposed. There was even a plot to unite in arms the Covenanting Presbyterians of the South West and the Jacobite Highlanders.⁴¹ Extreme Presbyterians believed that the Union would lead to a uniformity of worship and the destruction of Presbyterianism;⁴² that the Scots would become "slaves to the English". Ker of Kersland⁴³ estimated that some 5,000 men could be raised in this cause from among "the Cameronians", to use that word in its widest sense, whom he classed as among "the best soldiers in the Kingdom", and he expected that the other Presbyterians would raise about 8,000 men.

Except for the burning of the Articles of Union at the Burgh Cross at Dumfries on 20th November 1706, this upsurge of malcontents in the south west achieved nothing. Their vicious protest, however, was symptomatic of a general discontent and unrest over the Union issue.⁴⁴

The Clackmannan Kirk Session Records for 28th October, 1706 for instance read - "This day the minister representing that this

⁴¹ Secret History of Colonel Hooke's Negotiations in Scotland in 1707, Preface, p. I-IV.

⁴² McMillan, W., John Hepburn and the Hebronites, p. 126

⁴³ Colonel Hooke's Negotiations: Ker of Kerslands Memorial, p. 74

⁴⁴ John Hepburn and the Hebronites, p. 130

Church and Nation according to the present establishment was in great hazard by reason of a treaty that is presently under the consideration of the Parliament, the Session thought fit that they should meet on Friday next for prayer and supplication to our Merciful God that He may guide the Parliament in that affair, so as what is feared may be prevented".⁴⁵

The Synod of Glasgow and Ayr enjoined its Presbyteries to set apart a day in every parish for prayer that God might overrule the designs of His Church's enemies to bring about the Union.⁴⁶

Undoubtedly, there was great fear that an incorporating Union with England would provide no security for the established government and worship of the Church in Scotland. In the mind of Carstares⁴⁷ and his Moderates, however, there was grave concern over what might result from the schemes of rash, reckless men, who played blindly into the hands of the Jacobites. There was an element of risk in the Union, but it was a calculated risk, a risk that they felt they must take. As Sir James Steuart explained it to Calamy⁴⁸ years later; "It was impossible (for the

⁴⁵Gordon, T. ~~Growth~~^{Crowth}, History of Clackmannan, p. 131. Kirk Session Records, 24th December, 1706. Address against Union.

⁴⁶Warrick, J., History of Old Cumnock, p. 101. Kirk Session Records, 20th April, 1706. Instructions from Synod.

⁴⁷Carstares State Papers. Letters on Union, p. 725. Sir David Nairne, Secretary Depute to Carstares, 20th April, 1704; p. 728, Mr. Harley to Carstares, 20th July, 1704; p. 758, Mr. Harley to Carstares, January 7th, 1706-7; p. 759, Mr. Harley to Carstares, 8th March, 1706-7; Earl of Seafield to Carstares, March 27th, 1708.

⁴⁸Calamy, Own Life, Vol. 2, p. 171.

Presbyterians) to have secured their Church Government in North Britain, or to have kept out the Pretender without it".

In 1708, neither the Acts of Assembly nor the Address to the Queen make any reference to the Union.⁴⁹ Perhaps, to have done so would have been highly dangerous. Strong feelings ran very near the surface and might have swiftly and suddenly broken loose. Instead, Carstares as Moderator concentrated the attention of the Assembly on the recent threat of invasion, and reminded them that the real danger to their security lay across the sea.

In 1706, Carstares has a report from the Earl of Leven⁵⁰ telling him that several "people of quality", particularly the Duke of Athole, have been making representations to the Secretary of State about the severe treatment suffered by Episcopalians in Scotland, both in churches and in meeting house, at the hands of the Presbyterians. These matters the Secretaries were obliged to bring to the Queen's notice in as "favourable" a way as possible. There is no doubt that Leven thinks it expedient that a more moderate policy be adopted, and he tells Carstares that the Earl of Loudon is to write to the Advocate accordingly.

Again, in 1709, Mr. Pringle,⁵¹ one of the Secretaries, warns Carstares about the danger of too violent action against the

⁴⁹ Acts of Assembly, 1708. To the Queens Most Excellent Majesty, the Most Humble, Faithful, and Most Dutiful Address of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 23rd April, 1708.

⁵⁰ Carstares State Papers, p. 753. Earl of Leven to Carstares, 11th June, 1706.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 772. Mr. Pringle to Carstares, 27th August, 1709.

Episcopal party. "Though all thinking men, either with you or here", he says, "may be fully satisfied, that it is not a matter of conscience in itself with these who pursue it, and that they are known to be disaffected to the present constitution of the state; yet, if they qualify themselves, as the law requires, and show themselves ready to give full obedience to the civil government that is or shall be imposed upon them for that end, what objections can be made to their claims to the same privileges and liberty as dissenters from the established Church in the North, that the dissenters from the established Church here are allowed?"

He touches the crux of the problem. If the Episcopalians were willing to qualify according to law there is little doubt that Parliament would support their claims for legal recognition. This Mr. Pringle makes perfectly clear. He also goes on to warn Carstares that the more notice that is taken of the Episcopalians, the more opposition and censure that they suffer from the Presbyterians, "the better handle they have for trying the interest and strength of their friends here". His advice is that the less notice the Church takes of the Episcopalians the better. He does not believe that they will gain many proselytes to the English Liturgy, and he anticipates that when the present generation of Episcopal ministers has died out they will be unable financially to maintain a succession.

Mr. Pringle represented an English view of Scottish affairs. A view, however, which had behind it considerable support. In

the Lambeth MSS there is a Paper entitled, "Proper methods to Propagate the English Liturgy in Scotland together with Loyalty to her Majesty, and Security of the Protestant Succession" which was drawn up by Archbishop Tenison.⁵² His plan allows for about 40 Episcopal Chapels throughout Scotland. Six were to be established in Edinburgh, and one was allowed for every "chief town of a shire" and Episcopal seat. These chapels were to be maintained out of the Bishops' Revenues. Since the Queen allowed the Dissenters in Ireland to be maintained in this way, the same allowance might surely be expected for Scotland. Tenison lays down, however, that the qualifications for this support would be the same as in England: "Every one that keeps a meeting house should take the Oath of Abjuration": those who officiated without taking the Oaths would be under the same penalties as in England. "And because it is evident from Mr. Dunbreck's case that the decree of the Lords of Parliament is not sufficient to protect the clergy in the use of the English Liturgy, and none being now encouraged or countenanced by the Bishops in Scotland but professed Jacobites (he proposes) that all these things shall be provided for by an express Toleration, and that barbarous law rescinded which enacts banishment to all outed Episcopal ministers who baptize children, which was this year the case of Mr. Hay and others". It appears to have been Tenison's intention to offer the Scottish Episcopalians such favourable terms, amounting almost to legal and financial establishment, and providing them with the strongest possible

⁵² Lambeth Palace Library, Miscellaneous MSS, 954 (32).

foundation within the life of the nation, that he would win them from their Jacobitism. If this was his purpose he completely underestimated the durability and persistence of their Jacobite faith. At this time a constant stream of propaganda was sent into England setting forth the grievances under which these loyal subjects of the Queen suffered.

In the Wake MSS, for example, there is a petition to the Right Reverend Father in God William Lord Bishop of Lincoln from Mr. George Barclay,⁵³ a minister of the Episcopal persuasion in North Britain. Mr. Barclay's Meeting House in Edinburgh had been closed in 1708 by order of the Advocate. He had protested his loyalty before the Edinburgh Magistrates claiming, "that he did readily own himself her Majesty's most dutiful subject and declared that he did always pray in his Meeting House expressly for her Majesty's person and government". He had tried again to open another Meeting house and had been put in the Tolbooth. He had received no help from the Bishop of Edinburgh because he prayed for the Queen. So he had been forced to leave Scotland and sought a place of sanctuary under the Bishop of Lincoln.

Eighteen Meeting houses had been closed in Edinburgh, including Mr. Barclays in 1708. The Case of these Episcopal Ministers was sympathetically presented in a pamphlet which appeared in London, "A Narrative of the late Treatment of the Episcopal Ministers within the City of Edinburgh since March

⁵³ Wake MSS, Christ Church Library, Oxford. Vol. XIX. Unclassified MS, Petition to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, Memorial of Mr. George Barclay.

last 1708: With a Postscript".⁵⁴

It was pleaded that no compliance with the Civil Government was of any avail. These men had given every evidence of their loyalty and good affection to her Majesty. They prayed for her person and government and had signed a loyal Address. What then is their crime?. It is Episcopacy and the Worship of the Church of England. It was, of course, perfectly possible for disaffected persons to pray for the Queen, or, indeed, to profess loyalty to the Queen, without taking the Oath of Allegiance and subscribing the Assurance, which was what they were required to do by law. It was on this issue that the Episcopal ministers were unable to satisfy the Edinburgh Magistrates. The Magistrates rightly decided that their failure to do what was required of them by law was to "countenance a Party and Faction disaffective to her Majesty's Royal Government"; and that this was more than ever the case when an Invasion was threatened by the Queen's enemies.

Defoe published an, "Enquiry into the Case of the Treatment of the Episcopal Ministers in Scotland"⁵⁵ in which he seeks to justify the action of the Government. His view is that the Government has been too lenient with them since the beginning of Anne's reign, but now that there is threat of invasion, "the publick safety, the peace of the Nation, and the preservation of

⁵⁴ A Narrative of the late Treatment of the Episcopal Ministers within the City of Edinburgh since March last 1708. With a Postscript, London (1708).

⁵⁵ Defoe, Daniel, The Scots Narrative Examined. The Case of the Episcopal Ministers in Scotland Stated and the late Treatment of them in the City of Edinburgh enquired into, Edinburgh, (1708).

the Queen upon the Throne requiring it, the Government found themselves obliged to take new measures with these people".

He deals at great length with each individual case and defends vigorously the action of the Edinburgh Magistrates. These men, he points out profess Jacobite as well as Episcopal principles. To Jacobites who own a spurious Pretender, profess the Queen to be a Usurper, the Succession a Usurpation, and the Revolution a Rebellion, how can the Government do other than give "all possible disturbance"? To the Episcopal Dissenters in Scotland, however, as such, he claims: "No injury, no damage is done, no disquiet is given".

A LICENCE TO DISTURB

The Tory Government of Anne paid little attention to the pleas of the Presbyterians against the measures which they believed were aimed at the eventual destruction of their Church. Carstares wrote to Harley,⁵⁶ "There is no need for a Toleration". "The Episcopalians suffer no persecution". "They are under no obligation to conform". "What they seek is not a redress for conscience but rather a license to disturb". His advice was not acceptable.

The power of the Tory Party in England continued to grow and

⁵⁶Edinburgh University Library MSS. Collection of Carstares Letters, D.K.I.I.2, p. 228. A Copy of a Letter written to Mr. Harley. A Comparative view of Presbytery and Prelacy in Scotland from 1660 to present times. In the Lambeth MSS, 929(13), there is an Account of Parties in Scotland, 1703. The phrase "license to disturb" and other phrases are common to both. The Lambeth MS may have been written by Carstares.

with it the aspirations of the Episcopalians in Scotland. The successful appeal of Greenshields to the House of Lords clearly indicated that other issues would be raised by which the position of the Established Church could be attacked. Wodrow records the view of the citizens of Edinburgh, contained in an Address to the Commission of Assembly, 1710, that the Greenshields affair was simply a plot by the Jacobites to bring down both Church and State.⁵⁷ He also, unfortunately, regarded the ravings of the Bourignian prophets⁵⁸ in the streets of Edinburgh in 1711, foretelling judgment upon the City in 40 days time, as in some secret way connected with the Pretender's plans for invasion. Wodrow was inclined to see a Jacobite lurking round every corner. Yet, in the main was he not right?

The Toleration and the Patronage Bills he judged as both coming from "the October Club"⁵⁹ with a design both to thwart the Church of Scotland, and to stir up confusions and disgusts at the Government, and pave the way for the Pretender".

The Records of the Assembly's proceedings and the pamphlets of the time show clearly that this was, indeed, the view of serious and responsibly minded Presbyterians. James Webster wrote "An Essay upon Toleration by a sincere lover of the Church and the State".⁶⁰ James Ramsay wrote, "A Letter from a Gentleman to a

⁵⁷ Address of Inhabitants of Edinburgh to Commission of Assembly, (1710).

⁵⁸ Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. 1 Letter, LIV, 24th September, 1710 p. 169.

⁵⁹ Ibid., Vol. 1 p. 303.

⁶⁰ Webster, James, Essay upon Toleration by a sincere Lover of the Church and State, Edinburgh (1703)

Member of Parliament".⁶¹ Both argued strongly against its necessity. Ramsay, for instance, claims that a Toleration would break the good order and ruin the discipline of the Church. It would open a door for a deluge of errors and scandals to break in. If people are given a liberty to hear anywhere they will make it a defence for hearing nowhere. He fears that the granting of a Toleration will lead to a revival of the claims of Canterbury and York "for a government and jurisdiction over this nation". Whatever the merit of his arguments, however, he finally comes to the disaffection of the Party who seek to benefit from such a Toleration. They have been and still are enemies of the late happy Revolution. Whatever respect they may pay to the Queen, they have neither changed their principles nor designs. Their chief concern is for King James. No loyal address they have sent up has ever contained a promise of qualifying to the Government. Beware the beginnings of evil! Oppose a Toleration! Prevent the reintroduction of all the cruelties that this poor land has suffered!

Carstares, Baillie and Blackwell went to London in 1711 to try and prevent the passing of the Toleration and Patronage

⁶¹Ramsay, James, A Letter from a Gentleman to a Member of Parliament, Edinburgh (1703), p. 3-13; Bannantyne, J., A Letter from a Presbyterian Minister in the Country, to a Member of Parliament and also of the Commission of the Church concerning Toleration and Patronages Minister of Lanark, (1703)

Bills.⁶² Petitions were presented to the House of Commons and the House of Lords. An audience of the Queen was granted in which they explained their scruples at taking the Oath of Abjuration. All their efforts were unable to prevent the Bills becoming law. They did not, however, remain silent. Full advantage was taken in the Assembly's Answers to the Queen's Letters, in Representations and Addresses and Acts of Assembly⁶³ to represent to the Queen the Church's deep sense of grievance over the Toleration and Patronage Acts, and their scruples over the Abjuration Oath. At the same time there comes into the Addresses to the Queen, repeated and pointed affirmations of the Church's firm and sure allegiance to the Protestant Succession in the Illustrious House of Hanover, as by law established. In May, 1711, therefore, an Act was passed recommending Prayers for the Queen, and for the Succession to the Throne in the Protestant

⁶²Spalding Club Miscellany, Vol. 1. Letters from Professor Thomas Blackwell to John Ross of Arnage, Preface p. 55-69, and Letters, p. 198-217.

⁶³Acts of Assembly, 1712. Act Approving of the Representations and Addresses made by the Commission of the late General Assembly to the Queen, concerning the Toleration and Patronages, 13th May, 1712; Act Concerning the Oath of Abjuration, 14th May, 1712; The Humble Address and Representation of the Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, met by appointment of the said Assembly at Edinburgh, 5th March, 1712; An Address to the Queen concerning the Oath of Abjuration, 14th May, 1712; An Address to the Queen concerning the Representation made to Her Majesty by the late Commission, 15th May, 1712.

Line in the House of Hanover.⁶⁴

The Church had virtually lost all confidence in Anne's Government and had placed its hope in the Protestant Succession in the House of Hanover. Could it remain strong and united until that day dawned; until the House of Hanover was established upon the Throne?

So far as we have been studying, in the main, Presbyterian reactions to the issues of the time. They saw in them the machinations of Jacobite intriguers. Their chief concern was to keep out the Jacobite at all costs. They denied that the Episcopalians required a Toleration. They denied that a restoration of Patronage would help to win over Jacobite lairds to the side of the Established Church. They thought that to leave Episcopal intruders in parishes was to invite disaster. It was not they who suffered grievance it was rather the Church which suffered for every year such incumbents were allowed to remain.

It is possible to argue that this view is a complete exaggeration: that the Church's hatred of Liturgy was the real cause of her opposition to both Greenshields and the Toleration: that her opposition to Patronage sprang from her extreme doctrinaire Presbyterianism: that her dislike of Episcopalians and her distrust of their aims was rooted in her pathological fear of Prelacy.

64

Acts of Assembly, 1711. Act Recommending Prayers for the Queen, and for the Succession to the Throne in the Protestant Line in the House of Hanover, 12th May, 1711.

Were the Presbyterians right, or allowing for a certain amount of inherent dislike of all things Episcopal, in the main right? Was Carstares engaged in a battle against phantoms or did he wrestle with hard political realities?

Among the Carstares' Letters in Edinburgh University Library there is an MS letter which provides us with an answer to this question. In the starkness of its designs it is unique. If it represents the secret aspirations of the Episcopalians it is Carstares' vindication. The letter dates from the beginning of Anne's reign, and is entitled, "A Letter from some of the Episcopal Clergy to a Member of Parliament containing an Account of their plan for the Restoration of Episcopacy and the Pretender".⁶⁵ The letter begins - "As we account it a good omen that men of your principalls and temper come to be Members of Parliament, so the expectation we have of your acting your part in that capacity gives a reviving unto our almost famishing hopes. Your laying aside and refusing allegiance during the late reign was significant proof of your loyalty to our rightful King and affection to the ancient Apostolic Government of Episcopacy.

'We therefore are obliged to believe that your present compliance doth not proceed from any change of principalls but from a good design of serving the interest of the Royal Family by

⁶⁵ Edinburgh University Library MSS. Collection of Carstares Letters, D.K.I.I.2, p. 219. Copy of a Letter from some of the Episcopal Clergy to a Member of Parliament containing an Account of their plan for the Restoration of Episcopacy and the Pretender

restoring our banished prince to his due right and the distressed clergy to their former powers and splendour. We hope you are fully satisfied that these are inseparable interests, the same blow reached the mitre and the crown. The King could not be dethroned but by turning out our Reverend Fathers and abolishing Episcopal Orders. We have now suffered fourteen years affliction for our loyalty and religion under a prevailing Presbyterian faction".

The letter, then, deals with some of the difficulties which stand in the way of Restoration, and suggests means which may provide a way round. The English Parliament had already settled the Succession of the Crown in the House of Hanover. Since it would be difficult to undo what had been done by England care must be taken to prevent the Scottish Parliament from following the example of England.

The letter suggests, therefore, that it is "not expedient to raise the matter of the Succession"; "or to declare openly for the righteous heir lest the Parliament of Scotland should follow that of England". Then the letter continues: "For though the Queen may favour her brother more than a stranger, and if cherished with fair promises during her life be thereby the more inclinable to do justice to an injured prince, yet it will be inconvenient directly to impunge her pretended right". There is, however, a way round this problem. "If the loyal government of Episcopacy were first by law established it would be a promising step to the right settlement of the Throne ... seeing the Queen's inclinations in this are sufficiently known ... yet this also is to be managed with much caution".

The letter doubts if Presbytery could be removed "at one blow" in the Queen's name, but it suggests ways by which Presbytery can be undermined and eventually toppled.

"Members must be first sounded and a just computation of your strength taken and some previous steps made such as the restoring of the Patronages and granting us an indulgence with liberty to possess Churches and Benefices and this will undoubtedly make way for an intire establishment of our ancient Apostolick Government of Bishops, for the Queen having the right of Patronage in a great number of Churches she will prefer these of our persuasion to all others, and the rest of the laick patrons will follow her example".

The letter ends by stressing the urgency of these matters. Unless Parliament does more for the Episcopal clergy they cannot hold on much longer to the Churches still in their possession. They also badly need financial aid to maintain the Meeting Houses which have been set up; for there is great fear that such people as support them will leave "if the burden of our subsistence be laid upon them".

Devious as these schemes were they did not fail because they were not attempted. Indeed they succeeded in making near havoc of the peace and unity of the Kirk. In immediate perspective they failed because Anne died. They failed because the Tory Government fell. Finally, they failed because Anne's reign was only an interlude, a lull, in a deep and powerful movement of history that was to carry away the essential ideologies for which the Jacobites stood, as the slow surge of the sea does with sand-castles built by children on the shore.

Throughout Anne's reign the Presbyterian pamphleteers continue to accuse the Episcopalians of these hidden designs in the interest of Jacobite plans for Restoration. Typical is John Willison of Dundee who in his "Queries to the Scots Innovators"⁶⁶ says: "May we not suspect some of the Innovators of our day, as resembling French privateers putting forth English Colours to deceive simple merchants, and making their innovations a cover both for their Popish and Jacobite designs, for these interests are closely linked together."

"I do not say", he continues, "that all our Innovating Teachers are such, but what charity can we have for these, who openly arraign the Revolution, bespatter King William's memory, disown the Queen, with success to the French tyrant, Triumph on our Fast Days, and mourn on our Thanksgivings; and by their prayers, discourse, and beginnings of Healths, are Patrons of Disloyalty and Jacobitism, do not such persons look like men who would make a bridge and pave the way to carry you over to Rome or St. Germaines?".

Grave warnings and cautions are given. In "A Letter from a Member of Parliament of North Britain to a Minister in Scotland"⁶⁷ the writer lists the points at which the Church may

⁶⁶ Willison, John, Queries to the Scots Innovators in Divine Service and Particularly to the Liturgical Party in the Shire of Angus, (MDCCLXII), p. 12.

⁶⁷ A Seasonable Caution to the General Assembly in a Letter from a Member of Parliament of North Britain to a Minister in Scotland occasioned by the House of Lords Reversing the sentence of Mr. Greenshields (1711), p. 28-31.

give an advantage to their enemies. In such issues, he conceives the present danger to lie, and names them - (1) Breaches among ourselves, (2) Rash measures of all kinds, (3) Anything undutiful or disrespectful to her Majesty, (4) Anything that may look like encouraging the people to fears and jealousies either of their Government or their Sovereign, (5) Anything that may savour of desperation and abandoning the care and concern for the safety of the Church.

Great will be the confusion and disappointment of your enemies, he says, if none of these things should happen. From the hopes of these things they promise themselves great advantages. Their eyes are upon you. They watch for your halting. They stand ready to take you at the first slip you make. He warns them that as long as the Government protects the Church in her just rights it would be the wildest thing in the world not to do all that lies in the Church's power to engage and oblige her Majesty to continue that favour and protection, "on which under God we so much depend".

He cautions the Church that in spite of all her ill usage by private enemies she must show herself zealous for her Majesty's interest, calm and composed in her public Assemblies, moderate in her measures and resolutions and unanimous in the defence of Queen and Country against a Popish Pretender. Then, he says, we shall confirm her Majesty in the belief that she has not bestowed her favour and protection upon a useless and thankless people. "And our Episcopal Disturbers, like the Duke of Anjou at the late battle in Spain, will have gained the victory but have lost the day".

THE ABJURATION CRISIS

Perhaps the gravest crisis which the Church had to face in Anne's reign came towards its end. The decision of the Government to impose the Abjuration Oath on all ministers in Scotland, whether Presbyterian or Episcopalian almost succeeded in splitting the Church into two irreconcilable parties on an issue of conscience.

What the Church felt about the Abjuration Oath is fully set forth in several Addresses and Acts of the General Assembly,⁶⁸ from 1712 onwards. Briefly, the Presbyterians believed that the "conditions" of the Oath were against the "Treaty and Articles of Union", and were inconsistent with and contrary to essential Presbyterian Principles. They believed that they were being asked to declare on oath a support for Episcopacy and the Establishment in England which in conscience they felt they could not do.

The division which resulted in the Church between those who felt they were "clear" to take the Oath and those who declared themselves as "unclear" is reflected in the Records of Synods

⁶⁸Acts of Assembly above; Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. 1 Letter XCII, 6th October, 1712 and Letter XCI, give the opinion of Churchmen on the Abjuration Oath: an estimate is also given of the division in the Church and how the Synods and Presbyteries will vote. Letters C and XCVI give more information; Vol. 1, p. 344-5. On 6th November, 1712 the Ministers of the Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, who had not felt "clear" to take the Oath of Abjuration, issued a Declaration to free themselves from the charge of Jacobitism which their enemies brought against them. Also Synods of Galloway, Perth and Stirling, and Fife. Also, Carstares State Papers. Lord Advocate to Carstares, 20th September, 1708. "The Commission of the Kirk are met here this week ... I reasoned with them about the Abjuration, and told them plainly, that I saw no ground of scruple; and the exception against the as had neither the reduplication nor extension that was imagined ... the scruples are not only groundless, but I am afraid when these scruples should be removed, others would remain or arise, so numerous are we become".

and Presbyteries, in the Acts of the Assembly, in the Correspondence of Mr. Wodrow, and others. Parishioners would not come to hear a minister who had taken the Oath in certain parishes, particularly in what had been strong covenanting territory. A minister in such parishes dare not ask his neighbour to assist at the Communion Tables if he had taken the Oath.⁶⁹ Wodrow tells us that Mr. James Webster preached against the taking of the Oath,⁷⁰ warning not only ministers but also the College of Justice "to consider well before they took the Oath"; and promising, for his own part, that he would rather go with his wife and family to the utmost parts of the earth, and live on one meal a day, than take the Oath. To which Wodrow adds: "The Jacobites are so well pleased with this, that they never drink King James health but they drink Mr. Webster's after it". It is estimated that one minister out of three refused to take the Oath. They were willing to risk fine, imprisonment, and the loss of their parishes, and those who did take the Oath took it with a Declaration, which in effect nullified the design of those who imposed it.

Divided as the Church might be over the issue of the Oath there was no division, as the Addresses in the Synod records

⁶⁹Warrick, J, History of Old Cumnock, p. 105; Morrison, G.H. Bostons Memoirs, Introduction, p. XXIII and p. 266-272; Acts of Assembly, 1713. Act for Maintaining the Unity and Peace of this Church, 8th May, 1713.

⁷⁰Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. 1, Letter, LI. 4th September 1710, p. 163.

show, between the two Parties over certain points: (1) Allegiance to the Queen, (2) Affection to the Succession in the House of Hanover, (3) Abhorrence of the Pretender.

Again, the pamphlets of the time are full of this issue. One of the most objective of them in its treatment of the principles and consequences involved is by James Smith, Minister of Cramond, entitled, "A Dialogue betwixt a minister of the Church of Scotland and two of his Elders about the Abjuration Oath".⁷¹

Smith says that it was the object of the Jacobite Party to encourage the Presbyterians in their scruples and thus draw them away from their allegiance to the Queen, thus hoping to be able to pave the way for the Pretender. The Jacobite estimate was that two thirds of the Presbyterian ministers would not take the Oath and would be for the Pretender in the hope that he would dissolve the Union and rule England and Scotland as two independent Kingdoms.

Great as the individual and personal risks were in refusing the Oath, what were the dangers to the Church itself if this rash action was followed? They were of the gravest kind. James Smith sets down four. (1) By refusing the Oaths the Church rendered its Constitution wholly precarious, and laid it entirely at the mercy of the executive power, who could, if everyone refused the Oath, prevent Synods and Assemblies from meeting, and

⁷¹A Dialogue betwixt a Minister of the Church of Scotland and Two Elders of his Congregation about the Abjuration Oath, Rev. James Smith, Minister of Cramond (1712), p. 91-93.

even if they did meet they would be composed of men who would be incapable in law of exercising any part of their office in her Majesty's dominions, (2) The more recusant the ministers of the Established Church are the less they will have the benefit of the law against the recusant Episcopal clergy, whose toleration will be made wholly unbounded through the incapacity of the ministers of the Kirk to prosecute them through their own recusancy, (3) By refusing the Oaths the Church is playing into the hands of the Jacobites. They would like to see the Church wholly recusant in order that every minister might be turned out and Episcopal clergy put in their place. Who in that case, Smith fears, "would strain a point to get the Oath swallowed for love of their dear Pretender". It is to the credit of the Episcopalians that they did no such thing. Wodrow estimates that not above six Episcopal clergymen South of the Tay qualified;⁷² even although Jacobite politicians such as Lockhart thought that if they could push this issue they had an "opportunity for overturning the Church",⁷³ (4) By refusing this Oath the Church would "give a wound" to the Protestant Succession, and lose the friendship of the Illustrious House of Hanover on whom it was entailed. "This is an interest so valuable that nothing on this earth should be dearer to us". "This illustrious family, under God, so plainly is our chief support, that it must needs expose us to the

⁷²Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. 1, Letter C.

⁷³Ibid., Letter OXXX.

greatest contempt among our friends all over Europe to refuse an Oath chiefly designed for strengthening their claim".

This balanced and objective judgment of the dangerous consequences which would inevitably have followed if the majority of ministers had refused the Oath fortunately for the Established Church prevailed.

A sufficient number of ministers took the Oath, many of them like Carstares⁷⁴ making a Declaration in law of their true intention in taking the Oath and their interpretation of its "conditions"; and thus avoided setting the Church against the State in an act of constitutional defiance. A head-on crash between the two was avoided. Men learned to swallow their anger and their scruples, and to wait patiently for better days.

After the Rebellion the new Government made no attempt to enforce this obnoxious Oath, and the alarm it had raised in staunch Presbyterian hearts was quieted.

William Carstares survived to see the end of the dangerous and uncertain years of Anne's reign and presided over the first general assembly of the new reign. Ecclesiastical tempers boiled with a strong sense of grievance and insult at what the Church had recently been forced to endure. Instead of concentrating on their complaints, however, Carstares very wisely ensured that the Assembly faced the real dangers to her peace and wellbeing that still remained. Warnings were issued against the disaffected ideologies in their midst that would have persuaded

⁷⁴ Carstares State Papers, McCormicks Life of Carstares, p. 86-87, Deals with last years of Anne's reign and Abjuration Crisis; Story, R.H., William Carstares, p. 347-351

men to destroy the Union; and the Church's loyalty was pledged more firmly than ever to the new Protestant dynasty.⁷⁵

Two ministers in Aberdeenshire, who had refused to pray for the new King and had not kept the day appointed for Thanksgiving for his Accession, were deposed, and the Assembly terminated with the singing of the 124th Psalm, a Psalm to which many generations in Scotland have turned to express their sense of deliverance, and their belief in the triumph of God's purposes⁷⁶—

"Even as a bird
out of the fowler's snare,
Escapes away,
so is our soul set free:
Broke are their nets"

⁷⁵ Acts of Assembly, 1714. The Humble Address of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to Her Majesty, 17th May, 1714. See also: A Sermon preached before his Grace John Duke of Athole Her Majestys High Commissioner, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 6th May, 1714, Rev. William Wishart, 9, 14-19 Wishart in this sermon lists the "many and great difficulties" of Annes reign. Damnable Romish errors and heresies, the corruption of the pure worship of God by the introduction of the English Liturgy. Patronage which brought the danger of a corrupt and insufficient ministry. Our enemies were not afraid to expose us to the dreadful dangers of Popery, Tyranny and a French Government by espousing the interest of a Popish Pretender to the Throne, and their disaffection to the Illustrious House of Hanover, "which is one of the greatest and most valuable securities of our Religion and Liberties". He ends: "Therefore as soldiers that have gotten many victories, are thereby heartened to expect another, so let us thus fortify ourselves against distrust, God hath done great things for us, and we trust He will".

⁷⁶ Story, R.H., William Carstares, p. 364

Archbishop Tenison,⁷⁷ who in many respects was Carstares' ecclesiastical counterpart in England, and although a Prelate and a staunch supporter of Episcopacy, was nevertheless devoted to the Protestant Succession in the House of Hanover, also lived long enough to see the dangerous years end, and had the immense satisfaction of officiating at the Coronation of George I.

The Union had been preserved. The Illustrious House of Hanover had come to the Throne. The Protestant Succession was secure. With these achievements there came, therefore, that security for the National Churches, the one Episcopal, the other Presbyterian, which had been the chief object and the life's work of both these men.

⁷⁷ Calamy, Own Life, p. 333, 14th December 1715.

CHAPTER 5

TOWARDS REBELLION

From 1690 until the outbreak of the Rebellion in 1715 considerable opposition was shown in the Parishes North of the Tay to the settlement of Presbyterianism. The Records of events in Parish and Presbytery for the period give a very clear picture of the local strength of Episcopalianism. By acts of passive defiance and by acts of open violence the advance of Presbytery was resisted with singular determination. A study of the events which took place during these years is made for the major regions North of the Tay.

Lowland Scotland, on the other hand, was prepared to remain Presbyterian and was ready to resist every attempt to bring about a resurgence of Jacobite influence. The steps taken by Lowland ministers to rouse and lead their people at the outbreak of the Rebellion indicate the serious view they took of this attempt to reinstate Popery and Arbitrary rule. The defeat of the Rebellion linked the Church more closely than ever with the House of Hanover, and ensured the constant assurance of the Crown to maintain the Established Church in all its rights and privileges.

Argyll and the West .

Ross and Caithness

Moray and Aberdeen

Angus and Mearns

Perth and Stirling

Lowland Scotland

ARGYLL AND THE WEST

After the Revolution, apart from the great House of Argyll in the West, and a strong wedge of Presbyterian families in the North East,¹ Reay, Sutherland, Ross, Munro, Brodie and Rose, the Highlands and the North remained settled in their old ways, under the local leadership of Jacobite lairds and Episcopal ministers.

Only a handful of Presbyterian ministers restored by the Act of 1690 returned to the Highland and Northern Synods. A Manuscript Book in New College Library, Edinburgh, gives the figures as:- Synod of Argyll, 4; Synod of Perth, 6; Synod of Fife, 11; and for the whole of the region North of Tay, 11.²

In the same Manuscript Book there is "An Account of the State of the Church of Scotland since 1694."³ The Synods are dealt with parish by parish, and the number of Episcopal incumbents at that time is given as follows:- Synod of Argyll, 15; Synod of Perth, 12; Synod of Fife, 10; Synod of Angus and Mearns, 45; Synod of Aberdeen, 64; Synod of Moray, 33; Synod of Ross, 20; Synod of Caithness, 11; Synod of Orkney, 19; total, 209.

This body represented an Episcopalian party which was capable

¹Acts of Assembly, 1690. Commission for Visitations North of the Tay. The following were to serve as elders: Earl of Sutherland, Laird of Brodie, Laird of Grant, Laird of Grange Dunbar, Laird of Eight, Laird of Culloden, Sir John Munro, Sir George Munro, Sir Robert Gordon of Embo, David Frazer of Mains, Mr. John Campbell of Moy, Hector Munro of Drummond.

²New College Library MSS, Edinburgh MS Book. List of Ministers who being Presbyterians in 1661 did not conform to Episcopacy and who were alive and restored to their former Charges by Act of Parliament 1690.

³Ibid., An Account of the State of the Church of Scotland since 1694.

of maintaining considerable and formidable opposition to the advance of Presbyterianism into the parishes in the Highland North. This resistance continued right up to the outbreak of the Rebellion in 1715 with stubborn determination.

To the story, then, of the slow advance of Presbyterianism into the parishes of the Highlands and the North we now turn.

In the Synod of Argyll, where most parishes were within the sphere of influence of the Duke of Argyll, this resistance was greater than might have been expected. In the Presbytery of Inveraray⁴ all the ministers (5) either quietly deserted their charges or were deprived. Only two of them, John Lindsay of Inveraray, and William Campbell of Knapdale were received into Communion afterwards. In the Presbytery of Dunoon⁵ the story is the same, all (8) deserted or demitted their charges, only three were received into Communion later. Duncan Stewart⁶ the minister of Dunoon, was deprived by the Privy Council, but continued in his charge until 7th February, 1691, when he finally left to become an intruder at Blair Athol. There he continued to distinguish himself as a strong supporter of the Jacobite cause.

He was replaced at Dunoon by Walter Campbell⁷ a strong upholder of the new Dynasty. He had been a tutor in the Argyll family to John and Archibald Campbell, both to become afterwards

⁴Fasti, Vol. IV, p. 1-20

⁵Ibid., 21-46

⁶Ibid., 23.

⁷Ibid., 23.

Dukes of Argyll. This same Walter Campbell was responsible during the 1715 Rebellion for having the Presbytery Records taken for safe keeping to the Castle of Ardgowan.⁸

In the Presbytery of Kintyre,⁹ out of nine charges, only David Simpson¹⁰ of Southend, was received into Communion. The others either deserted or were deprived. Sweyn McSweyn¹¹ of Kilcalmonell, a determined Royalist, was deprived by the Privy Council for engaging in the Rebellion of 1689; while John McLean¹² of Kilmore, went across to Ireland. Kilmore proved to be a strongly anti-Presbyterian parish and continued to support an Episcopal intruder and a Jacobite schoolmaster. When the Presbytery's nominee, Mr. Dugal Campbell, went to preach, having sent his beadle on the previous Friday to warn the people that there would be a service, only "twelve persons came to hear sermon".¹³

In comparison with other parts of the Synod the three Presbyteries of South and Mid Argyll show an easier and more complete pattern of change than elsewhere. By 1694, with only two exceptions, all the parishes within these Presbyteries had

⁸Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Dunoon Presbytery, 27th December, 1715.

⁹Fasti, IV, 47-69

¹⁰Ibid., 66.

¹¹Ibid., 58.

¹²Ibid., 62.

¹³Craven, J.B., Diocese of Argyll, p. 164, Synod of Argyll, 6th March, 1694.

been filled by Presbyterian ministers, and the Assembly, accordingly, made demands upon these Presbyteries to provide much needed assistance for other parts. In the Isles and the remoter North the change from Episcopacy to Presbytery met with stiffer resistance.

In the parish of Innishail or Glenorchy¹⁴ the minister was Dugald Lindsay, who had followed his father in the charge in 1666. He refused to conform in 1689, and the Synod wished to restore to the charge a former minister, Duncan Campbell. When he came to the parish he "could find no house to receive him or person to make him welcome", and he had to take refuge with Dugald Lindsay, the man he had come to supplant. Long before the service on the Sunday people from all over the parish gathered in the churchyard. When the two ministers appeared, twelve armed men, two with drawn swords, surrounded Mr. Campbell. With two pipers playing "The March of Death" he was escorted to the boundary of the parish, and on bended knee made to promise that he would never return to the parish or ever interfere with Mr. Lindsay.

The Synod of Argyll was incensed by such action but in face of this defiant local hostility towards the new minister it could do little. Mr. Lindsay continued in his charge for more than 30 years until his death in 1728. Even after that date the parish of Innishail continued to support "ane old Episcopal preacher", Mr. William Campbell, whom the Presbytery of

¹⁴Fasti, IV, 86.

Lorne¹⁵ cite to appear before them in 1736.

At Lismore, Alexander McCalman, the former Dean of Argyll, managed to remain in his parish until his death in 1717. At the Synod's visitation of the parish in 1699¹⁶ he was strongly supported by all his parishioners. The Lairds of Appin, Airds and Ardskeil, together with the other heritors and elders told the Synod that they knew of nothing "censurable in his conversation". He had shown himself "edifying as to his doctrine", and "punctual in visiting the sick and catechizing"; but, apparently, he had not visited their families or given them the Lord's Supper since the Revolution. Again, local support was too strong, and the Synod had to allow him to remain in his charge.

Local opposition to the new Presbyterian minister could even force an incumbent to leave his parish. This happened at Lochaber where, in 1709, Mr. Neil Campbell¹⁷ left to go to Roseneath. Among the reasons he gave to the Presbytery for seeking a move were the following:- the cost of collecting his stipend was a third of its value; he had no legal manse, no kirk or meeting house in the whole parish; he had six places of worship to serve; when the Laird of Lochiall gave a considerable amount of material to build a meeting house at Kilmonivaig, the rest of

¹⁵Craven, J.B., Diocese of Argyll, p. 168-169. Lorn Presbytery, 31st March, 1730; Lorn Presbytery, 5th July, 1736; Lorn Presbytery, 28th July, 1737.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 188. Synod of Argyll, 22nd August, 1699; Fasti, IV, 99.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 301-302. Presbytery of Lorn, 1709; Ibid., 134.

his heritors refused to join in, and the timber was allowed to lie and rot.

Mr. Campbell had also been Chaplain to the Garrison at Fort William. After his translation to Roseneath we find that their Commissioner to the Presbytery is most anxious for the speedy settlement of a Mr. William Brodie in Mr. Campbell's place, since he is "a person well affected to the Government". He then went on to express fears that if Mr. Brodie was not quickly settled the Chaplaincy might go to someone not "of our persuasion", "who would not own us".

The ministers of Morven¹⁸ and Ardnamurchan¹⁹ were both deprived by the Privy Council in 1689, but both stayed on in their parishes. Alexander MacDonald²⁰ of Ardnamurchan ministered in the Eilean Finain part of the parish until his death in 1724. His family's influence did not cease even then. His son remained as schoolmaster, and was an elder in the parish until 1745, when he became a Roman Catholic, and took up arms on behalf of the Pretender. He gained a considerable reputation as a Gaelic poet, and his songs and poems breathed the fiery spirit of open and fearless rebellion.

Episcopal Jacobitism continued in these parishes for a very long time. Lang in his "History of Scotland"²¹ (1750) says this about them:- "The people of Ardnamurchan and the Stuarts

¹⁸Fasti, IV, 117.

¹⁹Ibid., 106.

²⁰Ibid., 106; Macdonald, A.S. Memorials of the Forty Five, p.127

²¹Lang, Ed. A., Highlands of Scotland in 1750, p. 70.

of Appin are the most deeply poisoned with disaffection to our Happy Constitution in Church and State of any people I ever saw. They idolize the Non Juring clergy, and can scarcely keep their temper when speaking of Presbyterians. The reason of this I take to be that one Mr. John MacLauchlan, a non jurist of the highest kind lived chiefly among them. This man, who was at least half a Papist and a most active cunning fellow, with a pretty good share of learning, did more harm among the Campbells, McDougals, Stuarts, McLeans, and Camerons, than any six priests that ever were in Scotland. He often travelled through these and the adjacent parts of the country administering the Sacrament of the Supper, admitting people only on the express condition that they did not hear any minister who prayed for King George. He joined the Pretender's son soon after he landed, and kept close by him till the battle of Culloden. He preached frequently in both languages and exerted himself to the utmost, encouraging both officers and soldiers to fight vigorously for their cause".

MacLauchlan survived the Forty Five, and in a letter to Robert Forbes of Leith²² (afterwards Bishop Forbes) he tells the dismal tale of what happened to him. "Now I live", he writes, "for the most part like a hermite, because all my late charge were killed in battle, scattered abroad, or cow'd at home; and the people of this country (the Campbells) are generally so bigot in Whiggism and so insolent on their late success, that it is vastly mortifying for me to live amongst them".

²²Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, No. 1129. Letter to Bishop Forbes, August, 1748.

John MacLauchlan takes us beyond the period of our immediate study, but we include reference to him here because he epitomizes the spirit and conviction of the Jacobite Episcopal ministers who were his predecessors in Ardnamurchan, Appin and Lochaber between the Revolution of 1689 and the Rebellion of 1715.

ROSS AND CAITHNESS

In Ross-shire parishes were kept in the possession of their Episcopal incumbents for many years, and the settlement of new ministers vigorously opposed by the Lairds and their tenantry.

Of the 31 clergymen who made up the old Diocese of Ross,²³ nine were deprived, one demitted his charge, and twenty appear to have remained in possession of their benefices until their deaths without ever submitting to the Presbytery.

At Urquhart and Glenmoriston,²⁴ Mr. Robert Cumming, refused to conform to Presbytery. He appears to have lived on friendly terms with his Presbyterian neighbours, but held on to his parish until his death in 1730, forty years after the legal establishment of Presbyterianism.

At Lochcarron,²⁵ Alexander McKenzie remained as minister until 1721. It was not until 1726 that Aeneas Sage was settled there, and, then, with considerable opposition. On the evening

²³Craven, J.B., Church in Ross, p. 65

²⁴Mackay, W., Urquhart and Glenmoriston, p. 370-390

²⁵Sage, D., Memorabilia Domestica, p. 6; Fasti, VII, 160

previous to his induction the barn, which was his only accommodation, was set on fire by a man who confessed that he had done this to try and rid the parish of the new Whig minister.

In 1711, the Presbytery tried to translate John Morrison²⁶ from Boleskine to Gairloch. On his way to his new parish he was set upon by tenants of Sir John Mackenzie of Coul, who kept him shut up in a cottage full of cattle and dung for three days. On the fifth day he was taken to Sir John's house and told by the laird that "no Presbyterian should be settled in any place where his influence extended, unless Her Majesty's Forces did it by the strong hand".

Local opposition to Mr. Morrison proved too much in the end. On 23rd October, 1716, he was given leave by the Presbytery to move to Urray. At Gairloch he had enjoyed neither manse, glebe, nor legal maintenance. He had been obliged to take a tack of land to support himself; but for three or four years people had driven cattle onto his land and destroyed his crops. His best cattle, he informed the Presbytery, had been "taken by the rebels during the Rebellion", and "very lately his house plundered of all provisions".

In January, 1704, the Presbytery of Ross and Sutherland sent William Stewart,²⁷ of Kiltearn, to preach in Dingwall and intimate the vacancy. The service was prevented from taking place by a mob from neighbouring parishes led by the late minister's brother.

²⁶ Noble, J., Religious Life in Ross, p. 98; Fasti, VII, 146.

²⁷ Craven, J.B., Church in Ross, p. 67-68; MacInnes, Evangelical Movement in the Highlands, p. 34; Fasti, VII, 34

Mr. Stewart was assaulted and threatened by a pistol. Sir Robert Munro of Foulis, who was attending the service with some parishioners from Kiltarn, no doubt to support and protect their own minister, "was struck and covered with dirt and mud".

In 1707, the Presbytery tried once again to effect a settlement at Dingwall. This time the new minister was to be Daniel Bayne²⁸ who had served as a Chaplain with Lt. General Murray's Regiment in Flanders, but there was still opposition. The town baillies could not find the Church keys, didn't know what had become of them, and refused to give the Presbytery access to the Church "under the authority of a considerable proprietor". It was not until after 1715 that the Presbytery was able to settle the first Presbyterian minister, when "the considerable proprietor" (the Earl of Seaforth) was no longer in the country to exercise any influence.

In 1711, Mr. John Grant was ordained at Rosemarkie as the minister of Kilmuir Wester.²⁹ At the next meeting of the Presbytery after his ordination he had to report that on the Sunday, accompanied by one of his heritors, he had been ambushed by a mob of about two hundred. Some had their faces blackened, and were armed with dirks and heavy battons. Mr. Grant had his hat knocked off, his head badly cut, and he was dragged by his cravat till almost choked. The mob tore his suit of fine clothes to rags. While all this was taking place, Mr.

²⁸Fasti, VII, 34

²⁹Ibid., VII, 14.

John Mackenzie, who preached in the Episcopal Meeting House, stood on a rising ground "feeding his eyes with their barbarous usage, and, thereafter, preached to the mob, most of them having pieces of Mr. Grant's clothes tied or pinned to the most open part of their bodies as trophies of victory".

The opposition to Mr. Grant's settlement continued. Nine months later he applied to the Presbytery to be translated to the parish of Auckinleck in Ayrshire.

In 1712, after the passing of the Patronage Act, Sir Kenneth MacKenzie³⁰ of Scatwell, the patron of Avoch parish, protested vigorously to the Presbytery against the settlement of a Probationer, Mr. Alexander McBean, without his presentation, and promised that Mr. McBean would be without Church and stipend as long as he remained patron. He was as good as his word. In 1713 Mr. McBean left for the parish of Douglas in Lanarkshire.

In 1728, the Royal Bounty Committee³¹ made a Report to the General Assembly on the situation in the Highlands. In dealing with Ross-shire the Report stressed the violent opposition and inhuman usage ministers of the Established Church had met with in the years before 1715, especially in the "countrys that belonged to the late Earl of Seaforth, and other places where Ignorance and

³⁰ Noble, Religious Life in Ross, p. 246; Bain, R., History of the Province of Ross, p. 249; Fasti, VII, 1.

³¹ MacInnes, Evangelical Movement in the Highlands, p. 36; Royal Bounty Minutes, Vol. 1. p. 277; Acts of Assembly, 1728, Index. Report of Committee for the Reformation of the Highlands.

Barbarity does mostly appear". The Report, also, adds; "It was from these countrys that the greatest numbers went out to the Rebellion".

What was the issue in these Highland parishes in the years after the Revolution? It was certainly not Presbyterianism against Episcopalianism as such. Between the two systems at that time in the Highlands of Scotland there was little difference. In terms of Church Government and Worship one was very much like the other. The Bishop was very akin to a permanent Moderator of Presbytery. It is questionable if the parish minister of Urquhart and Glenmoriston, for instance, ever used a Prayer Book. There was, however, no difficulty in distinguishing between the friends and enemies of King James; and on this basis their decision was reached. They were for King James, and, therefore, for Episcopacy. Whiggery and Presbyterianism were to them the supporters of an alien dynasty; and they were against both.

Caithness was Sutherland and Reay territory and has no record of active opposition to the settlement of the new Presbyterian ministers. Yet even with the support of Whig landowners the change over from Episcopalian incumbent to Presbyterian minister in the parish kirks was a slow process depending on the natural decease of the Episcopalian incumbents.

In Caithness³² there were ten charges at the Revolution. Of

³²Fast1, VII, 112-143, Presbytery of Caithness

the ten incumbents seven died in possession of their benefices, two conformed to the new order, and one retired to Ireland.

The MS from which these figures have been taken has a footnote which reads:- "Soon after the Revolution, a Committee of Inquisitors were sent from the Venerable Assembly of the Kirk to inquire into the lives and conversations of the clergy, in this and the neighbouring countrys. But having upon their arrival found that both the gentry and the people stuck by their old ministers, and had no relish for cant, hypocrisy and nonsense; they therefore thought it most prudent not to proceed to violent measures, and indeed it is highly probable that if Providence had prolonged the lives of their old ministers to this day, Presbytery would have been as little known in Caithness as it is in the New Testament".³³

Only one incumbent in the Presbytery of Dornock³⁴ conformed.

Such was the dearth of Presbyterian ministers that in 1698 there were only two, Mr. William McKay, of Dornock, and Mr. Walter Denune, of Golspie. Together with two ministers from Ross they combined to form the one Presbytery of Ross and Sutherland until 1696.³⁵

The Presbytery Records show that the Presbytery would

³³ Craven, Diocese of Caithness, p. 194-197; MS. Episcopal Ohest, Edinburgh, Memorandum for Rt. Rev. Robert Keith, dated 1749.

³⁴ Fasti, VII, 77-100, Presbytery of Dornock

³⁵ Bain, History of the Province of Ross, p. 248; Fasti, VII 84 and 86

willingly have rid themselves of those Episcopal incumbents who rejected their authority. Mr. Neil Beaton, of Latheron, for instance, would have been suspended by them had not Lord Reay advised against it. "The Moderator told that my Lord Reay had been at his house, but that the persons present were so violently set against Mr. Neil Beaton's suspension that he could not insist upon the affair".³⁶

His Lordship's advice was taken also in the case of Mr. Hugh Brown, of Durness. Lord Reay thought that it was unwise for the Presbytery to proceed against the present incumbent until they had looked out "a pretty young man for that paroch".³⁷

Although Mr. Munro³⁸ died shortly after this no successor was appointed until 1707.

The Presbytery, nevertheless, took what steps it could when local lairds failed to support a new appointment. In the parish of Dunnet, the Laird, John Sinclair of Ratter,³⁹ "not only absented himself and families from the Ordinances, but also encouraged his tenants to do so". He received a stiff letter from the Presbytery warning him that if he was not "more encouraging to his minister and desisted not from such wicked practices" he would be "represented to the Government as a disorderly and wicked person".

³⁶Craven, Diocese of Caithness, p. 188; Presbytery of Caithness, Thurso, 5th July, 1699.

³⁷Ibid., Thurso, 16th August, 1699.

³⁸Fasti, VII, 102.

³⁹Craven, Diocese of Caithness, p. 188

Lord Reay, no doubt, was more prudent than the Presbytery would have been. Since he was their chief supporter they could not very easily go against his advice. In the end prudence was bound to win. Episcopal incumbents without a militant and vigorous Jacobitism to support them must inevitably come to an end. Hector Paip,⁴⁰ of Loth, died, in 1719: Alexander Gray, of Assynt, died in 1727. With the settlement of his successor the change over from Episcopacy to Presbytery was complete.

The Rebellion of 1715 receives little mention in the Presbytery Records. The Presbytery's view of events is contained in the Minute of 3rd January, 1716, which refers to - "The unnatural rebellion raised by a Popish and Jacobite malignant faction in favour of a Popish Pretender in occasioning an intestine warr in our native land, which has waged now for a considerable time, and yet continues the evill that it hath produced and still threatens to our holy religion and civill liberties, the probabilitie of its leaving our land desolate and a field of blood, if not soon to be supprest".⁴¹

After the Rebellion the Presbytery kept a stricter watch over its old Episcopal ministers. In May 1716, the Synod orders them to "inquire into the behaviour of the Episcopal incumbents, intruders and meeting house preachers, to commence with the utmost

⁴⁰Fasti, VII, 95..

⁴¹Bentick, C.D., Dornock Cathedral and Parish, p. 259; Dornock Presbytery Records, 3rd January, 1716.

expedition lybells against them, and to send South a particular account of them". This the Presbytery did, but it reported that "as for intruders and meeting house preachers they have none among them".⁴²

It is not until 1717 that we find a reference to a Jacobite intruder. He was the redoubtable Alexander MacKenzie, "the late Chaplain to the Earl of Cromarty, and late Meeting House keeper in the parish of Kilmuir Easter".⁴³

MORAY AND ABERDEEN

In Moray and the North East there had been built up a strong Episcopal tradition associated with the work of Bishop Patrick Forbes, John Forbes, his son, and the "Aberdeen doctors". The leading families were strongly Jacobite, MacIntosh, Gordon, Huntly, Keith, Forbes and Hay. To a degree the North East had remained in isolation from many of the movements in ecclesiastical and political thought which had fermented and exploded in Lowland life. To the new thinking brought by the Revolution the North East presented a characteristic resistance. It had no reason to be dissatisfied with either Episcopacy as such or with its Parish ministers. It is G. D. Henderson's⁴⁴ view that Episcopacy

⁴²Dornock Presbytery Records, 15th May, 1716; Craven, Caithness, p. 203

⁴³Ibid., 15th May 1717; Ibid., 212; Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Tain Presbytery, Tain, 5th September 1716; Macnaughton, C, Church Life in Ross and Sutherland, p. 81

⁴⁴Henderson, G.D., Religious Life in 17th Century Scotland; p.234.
Henderson, G.D., Mystics of the North East, p. 28.

might well have survived permanently in the North East had it not been for its political sympathies.

After the Revolution the whole of the old Diocese of Murray became one Presbytery. The Records of this Presbytery do not begin until 1702.⁴⁵ In Aberdeen the Episcopal Synod continued to function.⁴⁶ It was not until 1694 that a Committee from the General Assembly arrived in Aberdeen to settle the North, and began to apply the various Acts of Parliament relating to Episcopal incumbents. James Gordon,⁴⁷ for instance, was minister at Foveran from the end of 1692 till Whitsunday 1696, before the Presbyterians were in a position to deprive him of his parish on the grounds that he was an intruder.

On 11th July, 1694, a nucleus of six ministers was formed into a joint Presbytery for Aberdeen and Banffshire.⁴⁸ The Synod of Aberdeen did not meet until 18th May, 1697.⁴⁹ At this date there were at last three nominal Presbyteries of the Established Church at work in an area where previously there had been eight.⁵⁰

⁴⁵Craven, Diocese of Moray, p. 79

⁴⁶Henderson, Religious Life in 17th Century Scotland, p. 232

⁴⁷Henderson, G.D., James Gordons Diary, p. 6-8, 12.

⁴⁸Seafieid Correspondence, Vol. 1, p. 155

⁴⁹Henderson, Religious Life in 17th Century Scotland, p. 232

⁵⁰Miscellany Spalding Club, Vol. II, p. 72.

The United Presbyteries of Turriff, Alford and Fordyce began with only five ministers, two of these were from without the bounds, and two elders.⁵¹ At the first meeting of the combined Presbyteries of Garloch, Ellon and Deer only three ministers were present.⁵² The Presbyteries of Aberdeen and Kincardine O'Neil were able to separate again in 1700.⁵³ Next year the Presbytery of Ellon was set up with four ministers.⁵⁴ The Presbytery of Deer was set up the same year with six ministers.⁵⁵ In 1707, the Presbyteries of Turriff and Fordyce⁵⁶ were once again separated, and, in 1708, Garloch and Alford were separated.⁵⁷ This record of the slow growth of Presbyterian Courts gives some indication of the stubborn opposition which Presbyterianism had to deal with in the North East.⁵⁸

⁵¹Presbytery Minutes, 6th May, 1697.

⁵²Presbytery Minutes, 28th April, 1697.

⁵³Kincardine Presbytery Minutes, 17th April, 1700.

⁵⁴Ellon Presbytery Minutes, 12th November, 1701.

⁵⁵Deer Presbytery Minutes, 16th April, 1701.

⁵⁶Turriff Presbytery Minutes, 16th April, 1707.

⁵⁷Garloch Presbytery Minutes, 1st December, 1708.

⁵⁸The Seafeld Correspondence, Vol. I, p. 101-335 contains a selection of letters written to Sir James Ogilvie from the Lord Advocate, Ministers in Banff and Aberdeenshire, Moderators of Presbyteries and others, between the years 1693-1701, which throws considerable light on the problems and difficulties encountered in settling parishes in Banffshire and Aberdeenshire with Presbyterian ministers.

At Moy,⁵⁹ a parish which enjoyed the protection of The Mackintosh, Alexander Cumming, a declared Jacobite, was able to remain in his charge until his death in 1709. For two years the Church at Moy was looked after by two Probationers. One of them, Daniel Beaton, was offered the charge in 1713, but refused the call, and went instead to Ardersier. It is suggested that the reason he did so was because The Mackintosh had decided to involve himself more actively in the Jacobite cause, with, of course, the support of his tenants. The Presbytery then sent to supply Moy a young man, James Leslie, of great physical strength and courage. On the eve of the Rebellion, March, 1715, the Presbytery proposed to proceed to his induction to the charge; but because of the Rebellion this did not take place until August, 1716. By that time The Mackintosh was a prisoner in Newgate.

Nevertheless, the Presbytery took steps to prevent any disturbance or demonstration at Mr. Leslie's Induction by asking Rose of Kilravock and Sir Archibald Campbell of Cawdor to be present. Leslie began with an intruder in his parish, Louis Grant, who constantly stirred up disaffection among his people. He was without kirk or manse, but he ministered there for 25 years, and at his death in 1766 the parish had been completely won over to the Established Church.

⁵⁹ Fasti, VI, p. 476; MacInnes, Evangelical Movement in the Highlands, p. 24.

At Daviot,⁶⁰ the minister at the Revolution was Mr. Michael Fraser. He was surrounded by a loyal people and was able to withstand the claims of the old Presbyterian minister to be reinstated in 1694. He continued to defy the Presbytery until 1715; but after the Rebellion the Presbytery set about ousting Mr. Fraser from Daviot.

On 13th November, 1716, the Presbytery Minute reads:-
 "Several ministers of the Presbytery represent that they were informed by good hands that Mr. Michael Fraser, incumbent at Daviot, not only was openly disaffected to his Majesty King George, but that ever since the late happy Revolution, he avouched his enmity at our Constitution; that he neglected in the public worship to pray for our former Sovereigns, King William and Queen Mary, and Queen Anne, when these Sovereigns were upon the Throne, and that he never prays for King George in public, nor his royal family, although required by law; yet to let all the world know his enmity at our Constitution, he joined the rebels at the house of Culloden upon 17 and 18 days of September 1715, whom he aided and comforted with his presence and advice, in giving them most wicked, savage, inhuman and barbarous counsel, and that he was the bearer of a most insolent and treasonable message to the Lady of Culloden, threatening the said Lady", that she must "surrender and give up the house of Culloden to Mackintosh, who commanded the Rebels".

⁶⁰ Fasti, VI, 448; MacInnes, Evangelical Movement in the Highlands, p. 24; Inverness Presbytery Records, 13th November, 1716; Craven, Diocese of Moray, p. 265.

In spite of this indictment the Presbytery was still unable to dislodge Mr. Fraser. In 1721, the Presbytery tried again, but their representative was stoned and had to retreat. In 1722, the heritors agreed to a legal settlement of the parish provided that Mr. Fraser was allowed to remain for life. Four years later he died after a ministry of 54 years; even then the Presbytery's representative found the Church door locked in his face when he went to declare the parish vacant.

In Elgin,⁶¹ in 1696, Mr. Robert Langlands and Mr. James Thomson were settled by the Presbytery in St. Giles, the parish church of the town. The Episcopal congregation then took possession of the "Little Kirk", or Chancel division of St. Giles. This was a strong and determined congregation, which not only called a minister of its own, but fought the minister in the Courts for possession of the "Little Kirk" and kept it in their possession until 1712.

Mr. Henderson, the Episcopal minister, was followed by two men about whose convictions there was little doubt. In 1706, Mr. Robert Calder, "a man well known for his notour disaffection to the government, and for the troublesome disorders he hath occasioned in several parts, doth now set up in Elgin". Such was the description of Mr. Calder given by the Commissioners to the General Assembly from Elgin. He was succeeded by Mr. Thomas

⁶¹Fasti, VI, 387; Craven, Diocese of Moray, p. 162-165

Cravey,⁶² who had been clerk to the Meeting of the Clergy of the Northern Dioceses held at King's College for the purpose of opposing the Presbyterian Committee for the North. His opposition to Presbyterianism finally brought about his banishment South of the Tay, and in 1708 he left Elgin for England.

Elgin was surrounded by parishes where Episcopal ministers refused to submit either to the demands of the Government, or to the authority of the Presbytery. In a Report to the Privy Council by the Commission of Assembly in 1706, the following passage occurs:- "There is also one Mr. William Falconer,⁶³ (afterwards Bishop of Moray), deprived some years ago by the Counsell, who has lately set up a meeting house at Forres, and is supported and maintained in it by men nottoursaly disaffected, and even such as by their office as magistrates are obliged to restrain and discourage such disorders". With the same kind of support Episcopal congregations survived at Elgin, Duffus, Alves, Forres, Nairn, Inverness, Kirkhill, Strathnairn, Glen Urquhart, Aberlour, Bellie, Keith, Botarie, Aberchirder, and Huntly.⁶⁴ These congregations were maintained in considerable strength, certainly until 1715, and some of them with even greater difficulty after that date.

⁶² Fasti, VI, 63.

⁶³ Ibid., 416; Craven, Diocese of Moray, p. 216

⁶⁴ Craven, Diocese of Moray, p. 153

Neither the Synod of Moray nor the Presbytery of Elgin were slow to seize the opportunity which presented itself after the failure of the Rebellion to make an end of Episcopacy.

The Synod of Moray⁶⁵ met at Elgin on 25th October, 1715, on the night Lt. General Cadogan, the Commander-in-Chief, was in the town. They presented him with a Congratulatory Address, and, also, handed over a Memorial containing the names of "Episcopal incumbents, intruders, and schoolmasters, that were either actually engaged in the late Rebellion against the King, or assisted the Rebels".

The Presbytery of Elgin,⁶⁶ in its turn, took steps to rid Elgin of "a Magistracy in this place disaffected to His Majesty King George and his Government". They drew the attention of the Commander-in-Chief to "the cherishing of disaffection to his Majesty's great and lawful authority in our parishes", and said: "We cannot discharge the duty incumbent upon us without acquainting you with some of the things which are in your power to redress".

Along the North East coast⁶⁷ the Jacobitism of people and clergy broke out into a wild wave of enthusiasm in support of the Pretender.

⁶⁵Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Moray, Elgin, 25th October, 1715; Craven, Diocese of Moray, p. 93; New Spalding Club, Historical Papers Relating to the Jacobite Period, 1699-1750 p. 30-35. Contains a full account of the Synod Meetings.

⁶⁶Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Elgin Presbytery, Elgin, 8th November, 1715, 21st February, 6th March, 20th March, 1716.

⁶⁷Taylor, A. and H., Jacobites of Aberdeenshire and Banffshire in the Rising of 1715, p. 222

The citizens of Peterhead,⁶⁸ the town of the Earl Marischal, mounted some Spanish guns on the Tolbooth Green for the protection of their town, and fifteen Peterhead men set out for Fraserburgh to proclaim James King. Mr. Barclay, the deposed Episcopal minister, returned to his old pulpit, read the Proclamation levying men for King James's service, and kept a Thanksgiving Day for his safe arrival in Scotland, praying for him under the name and title of King James 8th.

For having "cast off allegiance to a Protestant King, and openly espoused a Romish Pretender's interest" the Presbytery deposed Mr. Barclay after the Rebellion was over.

At Ellon,⁶⁹ the first Presbyterian minister was not settled until 1713. Here the Episcopal party set up a Meeting House at the Churchyard gate, where Mr. Peter Rose, schoolmaster, precentor and session clerk was their leader. At the Rebellion they retook possession of the Church, and barred the minister's entrance, so that he had to retire and preach beside his own house.

At Fraserburgh,⁷⁰ Mr. James Moore, a stalwart Episcopalian, followed his father as minister in 1703. Strictly speaking he was an intruder, since he was never legally minister of the parish.

⁶⁸ Neish, R., History of Peterhead; p. 104; Fasti, VI, 231.

⁶⁹ Mair, T., Ellon Parish Records, p. 155-6; Fasti, VI, 190

⁷⁰ Cranna, T., Fraserburgh Past and Present, p. 94-95; Fasti, VI, 222.

He was popular with his people, and enjoyed the protection of Lord Saltoun,⁷¹ whose wife was a daughter of the murdered Archbishop Sharp of St. Andrews. As might be expected from his family connections, Lord Saltoun was an out and out Episcopalian, but he was not a Jacobite, and used his influence eventually to end a succession of riots and disturbances which broke out whenever the Presbytery of Deer sent its representatives to take possession of the Church. In spite of conferences between the Presbytery and Lord Saltoun the parishioners were unwilling to part with Mr. Moore. There was no doubt, of course, about Mr. Moore's sentiments.

In 1708, the Presbytery⁷² records that "Mr. Moore and Mr. Craig are intruders at Fraserburgh". They "have got up the English Service there, and though in their worship they stick to the form of words in that book, yet when they come to that paragraph wherein the Queen's Majesty is mentioned, they do pass it by, praying for our dread Sovereign".

It is not until 1710 that Mr. Auchinleck, the Presbyterian minister was able to establish a Kirk Session. The town of Cruden,⁷³ a strong Jacobite stronghold, presents us with some unique features of Episcopalian-Presbyterian relationships.

⁷¹Seafield Correspondence, Vol. I, p. 167. Letter from Lord Saltoun to Sir James Ogilvie, 22nd August, 1695.

⁷²Deer Presbytery Records, 12th May, 1708. Fraserburgh Past and Present, p. 111

⁷³Mackay, A, Cruden and Its Ministers, p. 52-53; Taylor, A. & H. Jacobites of Aberdeenshire and Banffshire in the Rising of 1715; p. 224 Fasti, VI, 188.

Mr. William Dunbar had established himself as Intruder in 1691. He had neither qualified himself under the 1693 Act, nor in terms of the Toleration Act of 1712, but he enjoyed the protection of the Earl of Errol at Slains Castle, where old Bishop Drummond had found refuge after he was deprived of the See of Brechin. Apparently Mr. Dunbar kept on good terms with the Presbytery. He referred cases of discipline to the Presbytery,⁷⁴ They, too, referred cases to him, and both parties entered into a courteous correspondence about the Bourignonian heresy.⁷⁵

In 1703 Lord Errol died. The new Earl was a minor. It is not, however, until 1708 that the Presbytery felt strong enough to summon Mr. Dunbar for his intrusion at Cruden. When it does so it is by order of the Synod. In spite of this action Mr. Dunbar still remained in possession of his parish. In 1715, he declared himself openly for the Pretender. After the Rebellion a fresh process was begun against him by the Presbytery. He argued that the charges brought against him by the Presbytery for his conduct during the Rebellion were criminal not ecclesiastical, and that the Presbytery was not competent to try him. The Presbytery was impressed with this argument, and referred the case to the Synod. The Synod was less ready to listen to him, and promptly deposed him. (1716).

⁷⁴Mair's Narratives, p. 333

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 244.

Mr. Dunbar, however, was a man of some mettle. He still clung to what he claimed to be his legal rights. Eventually the civil arm had to be called in. A party of soldiers had to be sent from Peterhead by order of the Sheriff to take possession of the Church, and to debar him from preaching. In the following year (1717) he was prosecuted before the Lords of Justiciary on a charge of "intruding into the parish Church, leason making, and praying for the Pretender".⁷⁶ He was removed, finally, from the parish on 1st March, 1718. (In 1727 Mr. Dunbar was made a Bishop, and was Bishop of Moray and Ross until 1733 when he became Bishop of Aberdeen).

Mr. Dunbar's successors in Cruden Kirk met with severe and sustained opposition.⁷⁷ Mr. Wardlaw, his immediate successor, only stayed a year, and, then, left for Dunfermline. Mr. John Webster followed. He remained minister of the parish until his death in 1745. Yet only 17 heads of families were sufficiently interested in the affairs of the parish church, even at that date, to take any part in the election of a new minister.

It is interesting to note in the Kirk Session Records that the Episcopal party is always referred to as "the Jacobite interest". The word "Episcopal" is not used in the Kirk Session Records until 27th October, 1765.⁷⁸

⁷⁶Fasti, VI, 188

⁷⁷Mair's Narratives, p. 336-7

⁷⁸Mackay, A, Cruden and Its Ministers, p. 31. Presbytery and Kirk Session Records.

The intellectual drive and vigour of the Jacobite ecclesiastics of the North East found its source in the University and Town of Aberdeen.

Alistair and Henrietta Taylor list fifty-one clergymen from the North East who were implicated in the 1715 Rebellion.⁷⁹ The great majority of these ministers were graduates of King's College. Among them were the Aberdeen ministers, the late Professor Divinity at King's College, James Garden, and the Principals of King's and Marischal, George Middleton and Robert Paterson.

Immediately after the Revolution the Aberdeen clergy resisted fiercely the activities of the Committee for the North to win over Aberdeen and the North to the new Establishment, and refused to take the Oaths to William and Mary. On the Accession of Anne, however, a Stuart Princess, the City Ministers felt at liberty to take the Oaths to the new Queen. Dr. Andrew Burnett, who had been deposed in 1695 for not taking the Oaths, now returned to the city, took the Oaths, and ministered at Trinity Church.⁸⁰

In 1711, Mr. Patrick Dunbreck,⁸¹ the domestic Chaplain to

⁷⁹ Tayler, A. and H., Jacobites of Aberdeenshire and Banffshire in the Rising of 1715, p. 218-239.

⁸⁰ The Miscellany of the New Spalding Club, Vol. II. The Register of St. Pauls Episcopal Chapel. Aberdeen, A. E. Smith, p. 7-8.

⁸¹ A Letter from a Gentleman in Edinburgh to his friend in London, giving an Account of the Present Proceedings against the Episcopal clergy in Scotland for using the English Liturgy there: Jacobites of Aberdeenshire, p. 225.

the Earl Marischal, established a congregation in the Earl Marischal's town house, "of the best and richest inhabitants of the flourishing city of Aberdeen", and used the English Liturgy.

All the force of law which the General Assembly could persuade the Lord Advocate to use was brought to bear against the use of the Prayer Book by the Episcopalians in Aberdeen. The Episcopalians, therefore, claimed Royal protection and sent up a Loyal Address to the Queen with a Petition which said "We your Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects ... notwithstanding of the repeated assurances we have got of your Majesty's protection in the exercise of our religion, yet to our great surprise an order is lately come from your Majesty's Advocate in North Britain to shut up our chapel, for no other reason whatever may be pretended, but because we make use of the Liturgy of the Church of England".

Their argument was that they invaded upon "none of the rights of the Established Church" and that there was no "standing law in North Britain against the Liturgy of the Church of England". They claimed the Queen's protection against being oppressed "merely for serving God after your own way". The whole weight of their case was that "the persecutions of the Episcopal Church in Scotland were not founded upon the account of their disaffection to the civil government, as is falsely given out by their enemies, and too easily believed by their friends in England, but for their steady adherence to Episcopacy, and

their affection to the Liturgy of the Church of England".⁸²

The grievances of the Episcopalians in Scotland roused a great deal of sympathy in England, but it was a realistic sympathy, as is evidenced by Archbishop Tenison's proposals - "Proper Methods to propagate the English Liturgy in Scotland together with loyalty to Her Majesty and Security of the Protestant Succession".⁸³

After the passing of the Toleration Act, 1712, the City ministers of Aberdeen, and many of the clergy of the North East had complied with its terms, taken the Oaths to Anne, prayed for her by name, and used the English Liturgy. On Anne's death, however, the Northern clergy refused to take the Oaths to King George.

In spite of its former protestations of loyalty to Queen Anne it was apparently feared by the Government that Aberdeen's loyalty to King George was not completely certain. Lord Ilay, the Lord Justice General, the brother of the Duke of Argyll (afterwards Archibald 3rd Duke) wrote to the Magistrates intimating the approaching "demise of the Crown", warning them that they should "have a care for the public peace and to inform him of anything they thought likely to disturb the same". (Letter dated 3rd August, 1714).⁸⁴

⁸² Spottiswoode Miscellany, Vol. II. Grievances of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland, p. 395-398.

⁸³ Lambeth Palace Library MSS, 954, No. 32.

⁸⁴ Taylor A and H., Jacobites of Aberdeenshire and Banffshire in the Rising of 1715, Aberdeen and the Fifteen Rebellion, Preface, p. XVIII-XXIV, Burgh Records.

Before George I was proclaimed popular demonstrations took place in Aberdeen⁸⁵ in favour of the Pretender. On 11th August a procession consisting of a number of young men and two fiddlers playing Jacobite tunes marched through the streets and drank the health of King James 8th. at the Castlegate. Next year, on 20th September, the Earl Marischal proclaimed James at the Town Cross without any opposition. The windows of Principal Middleton's house were illuminated in honour of the occasion. The College bells were rung. A bonfire was lit before the College gates, and attended by Masters, Students, Bursars and Servants. None of these things Dr. Middleton took any measures to prevent.

On 29th September a Jacobite Town Council was elected under Sir Patrick Bannerman as Provost. On 26th October the Council ejected from the St. Nicholas' Church the city ministers, Thomas Blackwell, Colin Campbell and Francis Melville, and appointed in their place, George Garden, Alexander Burnett, and Patrick Dunbreck.

On 29th December, at Fetteresso, however, the Jacobitism of the Episcopal clergy was openly and irrevocably declared. Drs. James and George Garden, Dr. Burnett, Dr. Dunbreck and Mr.

⁸⁵The Miscellany of the Spalding Club, Vol. I Professor Blackwells Letters, p. 55-70. - For events in Aberdeen at the Rising: Also, Jacobites in Aberdeenshire and Banffshire, p. 273-278.

Maitland presented "A Humble Address" to the Pretender on behalf of their brethren.⁸⁶

The Address is written in somewhat extravagant terms, but it contains a plain statement of their Jacobitism. They thank God for the Pretender's "safe and happy arrival" into his "ancient kingdom of Scotland", and hope that his "so long hoped for Royal Presence" will fire his loyal subjects "to go on with that invincible courage and resolution which they have hitherto so successfully exerted for the recovery of the right of their King and Country".

Fetteresso was a Rubicon. It was impossible thereafter for Episcopacy to deny its Jacobitism, or to hide it away behind its Prayer Book.

All declarations of loyalty, all protestations about previous treatment at the hands of the authorities in Scotland, all assertions that enemies were spreading calumnies without foundation must be judged by the action of the Episcopal clergy at Fetteresso. Episcopalianism was the ecclesiastical face of Jacobitism. Behind its mask lurked an ideology, resistant to the changes which had taken place in Church and State at the Revolution, ready by force of arms to destroy both Church and State if it could.

⁸⁶Rae, History of the Rebellion in 1715, p. 476.

ANGUS AND MEARNs

Angus and Mearns presents a situation not unlike that of Aberdeen and the North East. It lacked the academic and intellectual championship of its Jacobitism which Aberdeenshire enjoyed, but it was the territory of some of the most fiercely Jacobite families in all Scotland, Panmure, Southesk, Ogilvy, Carnegie and Lindsay. They and their tenants used every influence to keep this part of Scotland staunchly Jacobite and Episcopal.

After the Revolution it was found necessary to unite the six Presbyteries constituting the old Synod of Angus and Mearns into one Presbytery; the Synod itself being joined to Aberdeen. In 1698 the United Presbytery of Angus and Mearns was divided into two Presbyteries - Dundee, Forfar and Meigle being one, and Fordoun, Brechin and Arbroath, the other. The Presbytery of Fordoun, Brechin and Arbroath thus formed had only five Presbyterian ministers in it, although it comprised upwards of 40 parishes. In 1701 the General Assembly disjoined the Synod of Angus and Mearns from Aberdeen; and in 1704 the separate Presbytery of Arbroath was constituted.⁸⁷

The Records of the Parish Church in Brechin show that Mr. Lawrence Skinner and his son, Mr. John Skinner preached morning and afternoon in the Church at Brechin until Mr. Lawrence Skinner's death in 1691. Thereafter, Mr. John Skinner took

⁸⁷ Hay, G., History of Arbroath, p. 185-6. Presbytery Records.

possession of the whole charge until 1695. At that date the Presbytery of Dundee took possession of the forenoon service and supplied it with a Presbyterian minister. (This was the charge previously held by the Bishop). Mr. John Skinner continued to preach at the afternoon diet of worship. This arrangement continued until 1697 when the Presbytery declared Mr. John Skinner's charge to be vacant and supplied the afternoon diets of worship also. Both diets of worship were supplied by Presbyterian ministers until 1703, when Mr. John Skinner "invaded the pulpit and took possession of the afternoon diet of preaching".

The United Presbytery of Brechin and Arbroath then ordained and inducted Mr. John Willison as the first minister of Brechin. Such was the opposition to this Presbyterian settlement that the Kirk Session refused to service, and the Presbytery had to appoint a Committee to look after the concerns of the parish.

Mr. Skinner made various attempts to regain his old pulpit with the encouragement of the Magistrates, "who refused all assistance" to Mr. Willison, and finally, he was able to do so for three months in 1715 with the support of a newly elected Jacobite Town Council. It is interesting to note that this Council did not elect a Provost. The Office of Provost was traditionally held by the Bishop of Brechin. No doubt, in September 1715, they thought it would not be long before a Bishop was restored to the See of Brechin.⁸⁸

⁸⁸Black, D.A., History of Brechin, p. 114-127: Presbytery Records; Fasti, V, 376.

In Meikle Presbytery there had been no Presbyterian minister in the parish of Ruthven⁸⁹ for some 12 years. In 1703, the Presbytery appointed two of its members to consult with the Laird of Ruthven about "planting" his parish with a minister of the Established Kirk. Neither the Laird nor any of the heritors appear to have concurred with the wishes of the Presbytery.

At Edzell,⁹⁰ David Lindsay the Laird protected his namesake the Episcopal incumbent until July 1714. The use of the parish church had been denied Mr. Lindsay by the Lords of Justiciary, but this did not prevent him continuing to act as parish minister. He preached Sunday by Sunday in the great hall at Edzell House. He kept a Kirk Session in being and managed all parochial business as if it had been a legal Session. He appointed the schoolmaster, attended to the relief of the poor, and defied the Presbytery in whatever way he could.

When in July, 1714, the Presbytery of Brechin ordained Mr. Gray⁹¹ as Mr. Lindsay's successor, which for safety's sake they had done at Brechin, the doors of the Church were shut against him by the Laird's order. He had to preach his first sermon as parish minister in the open air. For the next two Sundays Mr. Gray was unmolested, the Laird being absent from the parish, but on the two Sundays after the Laird's return he met with a riot when

⁸⁹Meikle, J., History of Aylth Parish Church, p. 161; Presbytery Records; Fasti, V, 274.

⁹⁰Jervise, A., Land of the Lindsays, p. 10-11; Presbytery Records and Parish Register of Edzell.

⁹¹Fasti, V, 390.

he attempted to preach and was thrown into the river and nearly drowned. After the Rebellion the estate changed hands, and Mr. Gray was left in peace until he moved to Brechin in 1717.

The Presbytery of Brechin did not gain possession of the parish of Navar⁹² until the death of the Episcopal minister in 1707. The Earl of Panmure was chief heritor of the parish. The first Presbyterian minister, Mr. Henry Hamilton, met with such opposition that on 9th January, 1712, he laid before the Presbytery a representation of his grievances at Navar, and his request for an Act of Transportability.

He was succeeded by Mr. George Leslie from the Presbytery of Deer in September 1714. Twice he reports to Presbytery that he has hopes of an eldership being set up in the parish, and even furnishes the Presbytery with a list of suitable men; but no eldership is appointed during his time as minister. The reason for this is not far to seek. It was not wise for any tenant to go against the declared Jacobitism of the Lairds. To have undertaken the eldership in a parish under such conditions was to fly in the face of the Laird's authority. For many a tenant farmer this would have meant the loss of his tenancy and brought him to domestic and financial ruin.

On 7th September, 1715, the day after the raising of the standard on the Braes of Mar, the Presbytery met at Brechin. The following extract from the Minutes reflects the mind of the Presbytery at that critical juncture:-

⁹²

Cruickshanks, F., Navar and Lethnot, p. 56-61, Presbytery Records

"This day the Presbytery considering the present state of public affairs and threatened troubles, do only think proper to confer about matters concerning the present juncture. Mr. John Smith came up, and is in readiness to deliver his trials for Kinnaird. The Presbytery find by certain advice from all the northern parts of the Kingdom that there is a Rebellion immediately to break out, and therefore it is not practicable to settle Mr. Smith at Kinnaird because it may expose him to the fury of the Earl of Southesk and his people, who, as they are informed have threatened both him and the Presbytery much mischief and damage if there be any further steps in this affair. Therefore recommend Mr. Smith to stay a few days further in this country till he get further advice with respect to the breaking out of the Rebellion to carry over to Edinburgh to lay before the Lord Justice General".⁹³

The following week the Presbytery sent off Mr. Smith to Edinburgh with news of the Rebellion in Angus and Mearns for the Lord Justice Clerk. "They got him off privately by one of the clock, Friday morning last, from Montrose, with a certain person whom they could trust to guide him to Dundee without touching the post road".⁹⁴

The Earl of Panmure⁹⁵ proclaimed the Pretender at Brechin Cross; the Earl of Southesk⁹⁶ proclaimed him in Montrose. The majority of ministers in Angus and Mearns⁹⁷ had to flee their

⁹³Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Brechin Presbytery, Brechin, 7th September, 1715.

⁹⁴Ibid., Montrose, 15th September, 1715.

⁹⁵Black, Brechin, p. 126

⁹⁶Fraser, W.R., St. Mary's of Old Montrose, p. 26-30.

⁹⁷Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. II, p. 126, Footnote. The Earl of Panmure had about 53 Churches in his gift, and the Earl of Mar more than this figure; Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. II, p. 92, Letter XXV dated 8th November, 1715 has references to both Earls and their treatment of Ministers and their families in Angus and Mearns during the Rebellion.

parishes. Episcopal intruders took possession of their pulpits, read the Earl of Mar's proclamations and prayed for the Pretender under the title of James 8th.

This incident from the Presbytery of Brechin's Records illustrates the action of the Episcopal intruders in the Jacobite parishes of Angus and Mearns.

The factor to the Earl of Southesk, Mr. John David, who had been an intruder before 1701, took possession of the keys of Strickathrow Church (Stracathro)⁹⁸. He ordered the Kirk officer to ring the bells, and assembled the people in the Church for a Fast Day held for the success of the Pretender's arms, "under pain of taking each man, master and servant, to the Camp at Perth". Mr. Davie, then, came to the Church at the head of a bank of 80 men "with beating drums and colours flying". "He preached a little in the Church, and when that kind of worship was over, he mustered up his men again at the Kirk gate", put himself at their head, and set out for Kinnaird.

At Montrose,⁹⁹ on 8th October, Young of Auldbar, on the orders of Mar, forbade the ministers to use the Church except they prayed for the Pretender. "To make the discharge effectual he put his hand on his broadsword, and the Magistrates

⁹⁸Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Brechin Presbytery, 2nd November, 1715; Fasti, V, 418.

⁹⁹Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. II. Letters XXXII-XLI deal with the Rebellion. See Rev. David Archer's letter, 2nd March, 1716, and Rev. James Trail's letter, 8th March, 1716.

got up early by two of the clock Sabbath morning to order the Church for the Curates, and had their pretended elders at the church door an hour before the time, lest we should have entered". So Mr. Trail describes events at Montrose in his letter to Wodrow. The intruder at Montrose was William Dunbar, former Episcopal minister at Laurencekirk, from which charge he had been deposed in 1693. He remained in the area as an intruder in various parishes for the next 25 years. Trail says that most of the ministers in and around Montrose had their mansees plundered by the Rebels, and had to flee. Some took refuge with loyal lairds who supported the Government. He mentions two, Hedderwick and Benholm, who, he says, "kept their ground very well". At Hedderwick, he and some other ministers preached every Lord's Day, "where we had a very considerable auditory all winter, notwithstanding all the endeavours that were made to break it".

At Glamis,¹⁰⁰ in the heart of Strathmore country, it appears from the Session Records that no Kirk Session was able to function in the parish until 1719. Presumably this was because the men who would have proved suitable elders, or indeed had been elders, had all been implicated in the Rebellion. On the other hand, at Auchterhouse,¹⁰¹ in a part of the country dominated by the Airlie family, where the manse was sacked, and

¹⁰⁰Stirton, J., Glamis. A Parish History, p. 90. Kirk Session Records.

¹⁰¹Inglis, W. M., An Angus Parish in the 18th Century, p. 73 Kirk Session Records.

Mar's Proclamations pinned to the Church door in the name of the Laird, in spite of threats and bribes the Session remained loyal to King George.

The kind of resistance, however, shown in Auchterhouse to the Jacobite lairds was the exception rather than the rule in Angus and Mearns. When things returned to normal again, the Records¹⁰² show, in parish after parish, that action had to be taken against elders, schoolmasters and beadles, as well as against intruders, who had shown their disloyalty to Kirk and State during the Rebellion. Brechin Presbytery decreed that all elders who had taken traitorous oaths should be discharged from their function as elders. They also decreed that elders and people alike who had taken these oaths should not be admitted to "sealing ordinances and Church benefits" unless they had confessed their sin before the Session, and had also made "public appearance before the congregation". All those who had engaged themselves in the Rebellion were to suffer public and open rebuke at the hands of the Church.

In order to make sure that these disciplines were properly and impartially enforced, the actual rebuke was to be given by a neighbouring minister.

¹⁰²Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Arbroath Presbytery, Arbroath 20th April, 1715-25th April, 1716; Brechin Presbytery, 7th March, 1716; Dundee Presbytery, 15th February 1716; Fordoun Presbytery, 15th February, 1716; Synod of Angus and Mearns, 19th April, 1716; Contain Lists of Intruders and Schoolmaster dealt with by the Presbyteries.

The Presbytery of Arbroath¹⁰³ meeting on 25th April, 1716 was informed by the Moderator that a Mr. Robert Tailor, who had been engaged in the "disturbances", "had now a child to be baptized", and that "he declined to allow him or his child the priveleges of that ordinance till he should make a public acknowledgement of his offence". Mr. Tailor was, apparently, willing to do this; and another minister was appointed to preach in the parish of Kirkden on the following Sunday "to rebuke the said Mr. Robert Tailor".

A clear indication of the difficulties which the Established Church had to face in this strongly Jacobite part of the country is to be found in the Instructions which the Presbytery of Brechin¹⁰⁴ (25th April, 1716) gave to its Commissioners to the ensuing General Assembly. They had to report to the Assembly on all the damage suffered by ministers "in the breaking and spoiling of their houses and goods by the Rebels, or any injuries, insults or maltreatment" they had received.

They were instructed to draw the Assembly's attention to the fact that "the ferment and disaffection against the Government both of Church and State continues among the common people through their lands, by reason of the disaffected ladys of the Rebels, their chamberlains and curates, that live among them, and have influence upon them".

¹⁰³Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Arbroath Presbytery, 25th April, 1716.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., Brechin Presbytery, 25th April, 1716.

They were to ask the Assembly to represent to the Government "the ill consequences of qualified Church of England chaplains, their setting up the English Service, through the towns of their bounds, in regard, the Jacobites service themselves under that posture, and give open and endless discoveries of their disloyalty, by showing their dislike to the prayers for the King, and the Royal Family, even in the time of this worship".

They instructed their Commissioners to represent to the Assembly that they did not possess a sufficient number of well-affected gentlemen in Angus to fill the offices of Magistrate and Justice of the Peace; and that it was to be noted particularly, "that the office of Sheriff depute and Sheriff clerk are still in the hands of such persons as have given plain evidence of their disaffection, and who had actually a hand in the Rebellion".

The Presbytery of Arbroath shows this same concern to have disaffected Magistrates and others in public office replaced by well affected citizens.

On 21st February, 1716, the Presbytery of Arbroath¹⁰⁵ drew up a Congratulatory Address to the Duke of Argyll on his recent "happy success" in arms. Added to their Address, however, was a Petition that "his Grace would be pleased to appoint such Governors in this place as would appear for the interest of the

¹⁰⁵Records, Register House, Edinburgh; Arbroath Presbytery, 21st February, 1716

Government in Church and State as now established". Nor did the Presbytery leave the selection of such suitable candidates in the hands of the Duke. They included in their Petition a List "of such persons as they thought most proper for that effect".

Several of the Episcopal intruders, however, defended themselves strenuously against the action of the Presbyteries to depose them. Criminal Letters had eventually to be taken out against the Episcopal Jacobite clergy. The cases of John Ouchterlony at Aberlemno, John Grub at Oathlaw, Francis Rait at Kinnaird, Robert Ouchterlony at Garvock, and David Rankin at Bendochy, were heard before the Lords of Justiciary in 1717.¹⁰⁶

Before the Presbyteries took legal action against their Episcopal Jacobite Intruders they sought advice about the correct nature of the charges which could be brought against them in law. The United Presbyteries of Dundee and Forfar asked for the opinion of the Attorney General on this subject. The Duke of Roxburgh, Secretary of State for Scotland, wrote to the Attorney General on 25th April, 1717, asking for his opinion. The Attorney General's opinion on the cases submitted to him is dated 27th April, 1717, and is to be found in the State Papers.¹⁰⁷ It reads as follows:- "There are several

¹⁰⁶ Fasti, 5, 277, 300, 395, 469.

¹⁰⁷ Records, Register House, Edinburgh, State Papers, Scotland. Letter Books 55 Vol. 6 p. 20. Also - Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Brechin Presbytery, 17th July, 1717. "Resolution of the Presbytery anent the Criminal Letters against the Episcopal Jacobite clergy".

facts charged on the Prelatical preachers some of which are treason, others very great misdemeanors. If the intrusion into churches was done by assistance of others in open Rebellion the Intruders in joining with them were guilty of High Treason in levying war against His Majesty in Scotland But if the intrusion was before the ministers had joined the rebels without their assistance I am of opinion they were intrusions properly punishable by the 22nd Act of Parliament, 1695. The praying for the Pretender and for success to him and asserting his title are very great offences but not High TreasonBut the inciting people to rise in arms for the Pretender is High Treason and an overt act of conspiring the death of the King, and so are the subsequent acts mentioned against Ochterlonie, for which the minister may be prosecuted".

This opinion shows the serious legal view that was taken of the Intrusions in Angus and Mearns. When, however, the cases appeared before the Lords of Justiciary, as Mr. John Ochterlonie's (afterwards Bishop Ochterlonie, 1726) did on 29th July, 1717, the Solicitor General "consented to desert the diet in respect of His Majestie's act of grace".

While the Government could afford to treat these fiery Episcopalian Intruders with a certain leniency after the failure of the Rebellion, the Church could hardly be expected to treat them in similar fashion. The view of the Church was that such ministers who had supported the Rebellion were by virtue of that very act guilty of a crime against the ministerial function itself, and therefore, whatever the legal character of their

offence, must be deposed by the Church Judicatories.¹⁰⁸

All ministers guilty of aiding and supporting the Rebellion were treated in this way, not merely the Episcopal intruders. Not that there were many in this category in Angus or Mearns, or anywhere else in Scotland, but there was one, Mr. Geddie, of Farnell, who was deposed on 22nd February, 1716, for disloyalty and compliance with the Rebellion, and his charge declared vacant.

PERTH AND STIRLING

After the Revolution the new Presbytery of Perth consisted of the old Presbyteries of Perth and Dunkeld to which was added half the Presbytery of Auchterarder. Out of a total of more than 40 parishes only three qualified ministers were to be found. To this number was added three more from without the bounds, which brought the number of ministers to six.¹⁰⁹ The Presbytery Records reveal the constant struggle the new Presbytery had to engage in against the Episcopal incumbents, the Jacobite lairds, and the Town Council of Perth.

In 1691, the Town Council opposed the appointment of Mr. Robert Anderson as the first Presbyterian minister of Perth,¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Brechin Presbytery, 29th February, 1716.

¹⁰⁹ Fasti, IV, 193-366. Synod of Perth and Stirling; Farquhar, Episcopal History of Perth. G.T.S., p. 12

¹¹⁰ Farquhar, History of Perth, p. 12, Perth Presbytery, 4th June, 1691

In 1692, the Presbytery succeeded in effecting a settlement at Erroll¹¹¹ after a battle against Lord Kinnaird, Sir John Hay and the other heritors which had gone on since 1689. In 1694, the settlement of a Presbyterian minister at Methven¹¹² was opposed with physical force by the Laird of Balgowan. In May, 1705, the Privy Council instructed the Sheriff, the Duke of Athole, and his Depute to see that the Presbytery was put in possession and kept in possession of the Church at Cargill.¹¹³ On 13th September, 1710, the last Episcopal minister was removed from the parish of Moneydie,¹¹⁴ by which date the Presbytery appears to have gained possession of all its parishes.

Among many of the Jacobite families in Perthshire, especially the Oliphants of Gask,¹¹⁵ there was an open and declared hostility towards the establishment in Church and State, which was by no means extinguished even after the failure of the Fifteen Rebellion. Wodrow records in his Analecta the baptism of Lord Drummond's son in October, 1713, in his own house, by a Popish Bishop. He says that when mass was said very few of

¹¹¹Farquhar, History of Perth, p. 19, Perth Presbytery, 12th January, 1692.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 22, 14th June, 1694.

¹¹³Ibid., p. 33, 9th May, 1705.

¹¹⁴Inglis, J.A., Last Episcopal Minister of Moneydie, S.H.R. Vol. 13, p. 233. Episcopal Chest, Edinburgh, MSS, No. 203.

¹¹⁵Oliphant, T.L.K., The Jacobite Lairds of Gask, p. 24

the noblemen and gentry present went out of the room.

"Several Justices of the Peace and others were present. This is a fearful reproach upon the lenity of our government, to suffer such open insults from Papists".¹¹⁶

In 1716, the Presbytery took the opportunity to be rid of all persons who were tainted by Jacobite sympathies. "It is neither safe nor convenient to employ either elder, precentor or beadle who has shown themselves Jacobites and have favoured the late Rebellion in any service about the Church". (29th February, 1716)¹¹⁷

The Presbytery of Dunkeld met with more prolonged resistance than Perth, or even the Presbyteries in Angus and Mearns. The Presbytery of Dunkeld dealt with its Intruders on 21st February, 1716,¹¹⁸ It deposed Mr. Alexander Comrie from the parish of Kenmore on 4th September, 1716.¹¹⁹ Yet Mr. Comrie¹²⁰ who enjoyed the protection of the Breadalbane family managed to remain in his charge until 1722. Mr. Robert Stewart,¹²¹ who enjoyed the protection of the same family, remained in the parish of Killin until 1728.

¹¹⁶Wodrow's Analecta, II, p. 254

¹¹⁷Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Perth Presbytery, 29th February, 1716.

¹¹⁸Ibid., Dunkeld Presbytery, 21st February, 1716.

¹¹⁹Ibid., Dunkeld Presbytery, 4th September, 1716.

¹²⁰Fasti, IV, 182; Gillies, W.A., In Famed Breadalbane, p. 268-271

¹²¹Fasti, IV, 184.

LOWLAND SCOTLAND

In Lowland Scotland Presbyterianism had established itself firmly at the Revolution. To Presbyterian minds Jacobitism held the constant threat of the return of Popery, Prelacy and Arbitrary Rule. It was a threat which was opposed with robust determination.

Glasgow, for instance, had declared itself against both Episcopacy and Jacobitism in 1687, when under the Indulgence of James II, two Presbyterian Meeting Houses were set up, in one of which Mr. James Wodrow,¹²² father of the Church historian, ministered. McUre, who lived through these times says: "The very far greater part of the inhabitants left the Church and flocked to the indulged ministers".¹²³ The Presbyterian population of Glasgow grew steadily during the early years of the 18th Century, and necessitated the building of new City Churches.¹²⁴

In May, 1692, Glasgow sent up a Loyal Address to the King and Queen, which showed the sentiments of this growing Presbyterian City, and promised immediate assistance to resist any attempt at invasion of the Kingdom by "French or Irish Papists".¹²⁵

In July, 1713, three Addresses¹²⁶ were sent up to the Queen

¹²²Renwick, R., Glasgow Memorials, p. 282; Life of James Wodrow, p. 80-85.

¹²³McUre, History of Glasgow, p. 60.

¹²⁴McGregor, G., History of Glasgow, p. 299

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 274.

¹²⁶Boyer's Political State of Britain During the Four Last Years of Queen Annes Reign, Vol. III, p. 6-7

from Scotland. The one from Inverness was presented by Sir Hugh Paterson, Bt., and introduced by the Earl of Mar. It said: "We, without reserve, depend on your Majesty's wisdom in securing our religion and the succession to the hereditary Crown of Great Britain, in the family of your Royal Progenitors, the most ancient line of succession in the world". An Address in similar terms was sent up by the Loyal Burgh of Nairn.

The third Address was sent up from the City of Glasgow and was in a very different strain. It dealt with some of the critical issues which exercised the minds of Presbyterian Scotland. These were - the Queen's declarations relating to the Protestant Succession in the House of Hanover; Her Majesty's assurances given for the Protection of the Church of Scotland; and expressed the conviction that "the Protestant Religion, Laws and Liberties of these nations be continued to us by securing the Succession as Limited by Parliament".

This Address was presented by the Member for Glasgow, and was introduced by the Duke of Argyle. In 1714, after the Proclamation of King George, the Glasgow mob demonstrated its enthusiasm for the new Royal House by sacking the Chapel of the Episcopal curate, Mr. Cockburn, one of the few reminders of the Jacobite interest in their city.

At the outbreak of the Rebellion the Magistrates of Glasgow¹²⁷ sent up a Loyal Address to the King assuring him of

¹²⁷ McGregor, G., History of Glasgow, p. 292

their loyalty, and offering to supply for his service a Regiment consisting of 500 men, to be sustained for 60 days at the expense of the City.

"Wodrow's Correspondence" gives a very fair insight into the contemporary Presbyterian view of Highland Scotland in the years just before the outbreak of the Rebellion.

Writing to the Rev. Cotton Mather, D.D., in Boston, in December, 1713, about the State of Affairs in Scotland, he says: "Our Highland clans are very barefaced in their appearance for the Pretender, and its said that great sums of money remitted to them from London, under the pretext of engaging them to keep the peace. What is the treasurer's design in sending them so much money I am not fit to judge, but they have all along been so wedded to the interests of France and the Pretender, and are providing themselves so fast in arms and ammunition, we have ground to fear they are ready to shed the blood of war in time of peace".¹²⁸

An "Occasional Reflection made against the ministers for remitting annually about £40,000 to the Clans of Scotland"¹²⁹ is a speech made by the Duke of Argyle which supports Wodrow's estimation of the events taking place in the Highlands. He maintained that the Scotch Highlanders were for the most part

¹²⁸ Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. I. Letter CLX, 15th December, 1713, p. 528; Also his letter to Mr. John McBride at Belfast, 10th February, 1714. Letter CLXV, p. 544.

¹²⁹ Boyer's History, p. 319, 9th April, 1714.

either rank Papists or declared Jacobites; and that to give them "pensions" was, in effect, to assist them "to keep up Popish seminaries" and "foment rebellion".

Next year, writing to Mr. McCracken¹³⁰ in Lisburn, Ireland, Wodrow, obviously thinks that things are coming to a head in the North. "Our Papists, Highlanders, Jacobites and English Servicemen, are mightily aloft and expecting great things in a few days, either from the Queen's demise, which they long for, or a visit from their king. And we, on the other hand, are a poor declining, broken and spiritless people; though I must own, since I wrote last, people seem to be gathering a little more life, and a little brisker for liberty, and, as they say, for religion than I have seen them. But we need somewhat to awaken, and quicken and unite us further".

Towards the end of 1714 and the beginning of 1715 Wodrow's Correspondence contains several letters which show the fear in Presbyterian circles of the activities by Jacobite agents to rouse a popular clamour against the Union. Special mention is made of a proposed "Jacobite Address for a Dissolution of the Union". The promoters of this Address were endeavouring to persuade Presbyterian ministers to sign it, especially the Non Jurors. Their fear was: "That as the cry of the Church's

¹³⁰ Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. I. Letter CLXIV, February 10th 1714, p. 528.

danger in England,¹³¹ so this of the Union here, is to be the handle whereby to disturb our present happy settlement of the King's affairs, and so to sour our people's tempers as to make them ready to receive the Pretender".¹³² Principal Wishart¹³³ wrote to Wodrow telling him about the meeting of the Advocates in Edinburgh to deal with this Address, and says, that it was thrown out of doors: but adds that some resolved to subscribe it, "each man for himself". Liberton parish was canvassed for subscriptions to this Address "among the tenants and others of the vulgar, but very few or none subscribe it, except boys and servantmen".

Wodrow, however, need not have been so despondent about the state of affairs in Scotland. The "something" which was to "awaken" and "quicken" and "unite" them was not to be long delayed. His Letters begin to tell the story of the preparations made in Lowland Scotland against the feared invasion

¹³¹Rae's History of the Rebellion, p. 5 "Dr. Henry Sacheverel, a High Church clergyman, and valiant champion of the Romish faction, upon the 5th November 1709 mounted the pulpit of St. Pauls, and gave the alarm "That the Church was in Danger"". See also Pamphlets Sacheverel.

¹³²Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. I, Letter CLXXIII, 23rd December, 1714, p. 633, and Mr. Wyllie's letter to Wodrow, p. 636.

¹³³Ibid., Vol. II, p. 19. Footnote, Principal Wishart's letter to Wodrow, 28th January, 1715.

of French troops. Glasgow¹³⁴ raised 4,000 militia and dug a twelve foot broad trench round the city for defence. Dumfries raised 2,000 militia. "Musterings are going steadily on, especially in the shire of Ayr". He mentions a "rendezvous of all the fencible men of Cunningham in Irvine Muir, and they tell me they make a gallant appearance, upwards of 3,000 well armed men".¹³⁵

Not unexpectedly we find the Synod of Dumfries,¹³⁶ at its April Meeting in 1716 noting with approval; "That almost the whole country were obliged to rise in arms for the defence of our Religion and Liberties"; and "That every minister both in their pulpits and in a privat capacity did what they could to impress the people with their danger and duty". Some read the Admonition of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr from their pulpits, and encouraged their people "to make a stand against the rebels, which was not without pretty good success".

It was outside Dumfries, too, that Hepburn¹³⁷ assembled his force of 300 men under their yellow silk banner inscribed with

¹³⁴Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. II. Letter XXV to Rev. Robert Black, Rotterdam, 8th November, 1715, p. 84.

¹³⁵Ibid., Vol. II. Letter XX to Rev., James Hart, p. 62.

¹³⁶Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Dumfries 10th April, 1716.

¹³⁷Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. II. Progress of the Rebellion and its Causes. Letter XXV, p. 92; McMillan, W. John Hepburn and the Hebronites, p. 178-185; Frew, D., History of Urr, p. 39-40; Fleming, Hay, Critical Reviews Relating Chiefly to Scotland, p. 410.

large black letters - "For the Lord of Hosts".

Hepburn presented a very real problem to the ministers and citizens of Dumfries. Would he side with the Jacobite army under Kenmure, or help in the defence of the Town? Wodrow's view of both McMillan and Hepburn was that they were not to be relied upon. "One day they are one way and the next another". Hepburn, too, had strongly denounced the Union. Since one of the strong points of the Jacobite Manifesto was the dissolution of the Union, there was much anxiety about which side he and his men would support. Hepburn's hatred of Popery, however, was greater than his dissatisfaction with the policies of the Church or the Government. Although he refused to come within the town's fortifications he represented a sizeable force on the other side of the Nith. So much so that the Earl of Kenmure avoided Dumfries and passed Southwards to join forces with the Jacobite army in the North of England.

In March, 1714, there had been "a concert", Rae¹³⁸ says, "of the well affected gentlemen" in the southern and western shires at Dalmellington. This assembly laid down certain measures for their general security under five heads:-

- (1) A general correspondence was to be kept between the shires of Clydesdale, Renfrew, Ayr, Galloway and Nithsdale, and a meeting was to be held each quarter
- (2) Regular meetings were to be held in each Shire.

¹³⁸Rae, History of the Rebellion, p. 42-43

- (3) They were to obtain intelligence from London about events
- (4) They were to keep in correspondence with their friends in Ireland.
- (5) They were to take steps to train people for defence.

The Presbytery of Penpont acted on this resolution and employed a Sergeant Scott from Edinburgh Castle to assist in training their people.

On 16th September, 1715, the Duke of Argyle¹³⁹ sent a letter from Edinburgh to Fergusson of Craigdarroch, asking him to proceed to Stirling with "what number of well armed men you can get together to join the King's Regular Forces".

Prompt action followed the receipt of this letter. Sixty men from the parishes of Glencairn and Tinron joined a large body of armed men with "the ministers" from these parishes at Penpont. Among Craigdarroch's force, which marched to Stirling, were "Mr. Simon Riddell, minister of Tinron, Mr. John Pollock, minister of Glencairn, and Mr. Thomas Hunter, minister of Dornoch".¹⁴⁰

The Synod of Galloway¹⁴¹ met at Wigtown on 18th October, 1715, and set about raising as many men as it could for the Government. A Representation was put forward by James Agnew of Lochnew, in his own name, and on behalf of the other Deputy Lieutenants of the Shire, to the effect that each minister should

¹³⁹ Corrie, J. Glencairn, p. 93

¹⁴⁰ Fasti, 2, 327, Tinron, p. 245, Dornock; Dow, A.C., Ministers to the Soldiers of Scotland, chapter 9

¹⁴¹ Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Galloway, 18th October, 1715.

produce an armed man for service with forty days pay or contribute £3 to pay the men gathered by the Deputy Lieutenant at Stranraer. All the Presbyteries in the Synod agreed to this scheme - "three pounds or one armed man with forty days pay" contributed by each minister.

Thomas Boston, unrepentant opponent to the Abjuration Oath even after it had been made easier for men of tender conscience to take it, read the proclamation from his pulpit inviting men to join the King's service, and preached a sermon to the occasion in which he reproved "those who at this time are secure, careless, and unconcerned spectators of the present confusions". "Is religion", he asks, "not concerned whether a Protestant King or a Papist be on the Throne? Whether an army of Papists and malignants, avowed enemies of the Church of Scotland, carry the day, or an army employed to break them?" "I tell you that your security and unconcernedness at this time is more dangerous than ye are aware of. They do not lie most safe who lie most secure, when the cause of God is at stake".¹⁴²

On Tuesday, 18th October, 1715, the Synod of Merse and Teviotdale¹⁴³ met at Kelso, in the very path of the Jacobite army's march South. Boston says that when he arrived at Kelso, "the horse were out to observe the enemy, and the town was looking

¹⁴²Morrison, G.H., Boston's Memoirs, Appendix 2, p. 486

¹⁴³Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Merse and Teviotdale, 18th October, 1715.

for their approach to attack them". "People from all corners and from our neighbouring parish of Yarrow particularly, had come in to help the Lord against the mighty".¹⁴⁴ The Synod appointed a Committee to draw up a warning against the Rebellion to be read from the pulpits with "suitable exhortations". This work was carried through by Thomas Boston and James Ramsay, of Kelso. Before the 1715 Rebellion Ramsay played a leading part in rallying local anti-Jacobite support in and around Kelso. Encouraged by him, Sir William Bennett of Grubbet and Sir John Pringle of Stichel led the inhabitants of Kelso and the surrounding countryside to bind themselves into an Association - "To assist and stand by one another in defence of the Sovereign, King George, the successor of the Crown, happily established by law, and the Protestant Religion in opposition to a Popish Pretender and all his abettors".¹⁴⁵

After the Rebellion was over Synods and General Assembly sent up to His Majesty dutiful Addresses of Thanksgiving for their Deliverance from the Pretender.

These express fully and forcibly their great sense of deliverance from an enemy who would have brought about their utter destruction.

The Synod of Glasgow and Ayr¹⁴⁶ said; "The Presbyterian

¹⁴⁴ Morrison, Boston's Memoirs, p. 294

¹⁴⁵ Warrick, J., The Moderators of the Church of Scotland, 1690-1740, p. 335.

¹⁴⁶ Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Clydesdale (Glasgow and Ayr), 4th April, 1716.

establishment of this National Church was in hazard of being overturned". "The Protestant Religion and civil liberty, not only in Britain but over all Europe was in danger of being swallowed up in Popery and arbitrary power; and the pure preaching of the Gospel universally suppressed, as in part it was where the rebels prevailed".

In the far North the Synod of Ross and Sutherland¹⁴⁷ said: "It is with the greatest pleasure that we who live in these remoter parts of your Majesty's dominions embrace this opportunity of assuring your Majesty of our intrepid loyalty, from which we are resolved, by the Divine assistance, that not threats nor sufferings from your Majesty's enemies shall be able to withdraw us, and that we and all our communion are ready to sacrifice lives and fortunes for the best of causes, and the best of Kings".

The Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale¹⁴⁸ met in Edinburgh on 1st November, 1715, and appointed a small Committee, consisting of James Webster, William Mitchel, William Hamilton and James Hart, minister, together with two ruling elders, the Lord Justice Clerk and the Lord Advocate, to draw up an "Admonition anent the Rebellion". This Committee produced a most comprehensive Admonition, which runs to six pages in the Minute book, from

¹⁴⁷ Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Ross and Sutherland, 22nd September, 1715.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, 1st November, 1715.

which are taken only the two following points. They regarded "the specious pretences of the rebels to redress our grievances, to secure our interests and dissolve the Union", as but "vain announcements to ensnare unthinking people and to save themselves at the expense of their blood".

They had no doubt that if the Popish Pretender, "whose principles oblige him to advance the interests of anti Christ", had been forced upon them, not only would the whole country have blazed with the flames of martyrdom, "but the whole Reformation in Europe" would have been in the greatest danger.

In April, 1716, the Synod sent up a Loyal Address¹⁴⁹ to the King, in which they make very plain what they thought about the conduct of the Episcopalians during the recent Rebellion: "For Protestants to take up arms for a Popish Pretender in order to secure them a Protestant constitution, and the bringing in a French tyranny for the protection of British liberties, are contradictions chocking to common sense".

Then they strike a note which is not included in any of the other Addresses to the Crown: "And what fills our heart with grief is that your Majesty, who out of zeal for the Protestant Religion left loyal affectionate subjects of your own to come and save us, should meet with so base a return from any that take the name of Protestant upon them, and who were under all the

¹⁴⁹ Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, 26th April, 1716.

obligations of honour and conscience to assert and maintain your title to the Throne".

In May, 1716, the General Assembly sent up its Congratulatory Address to the King upon the Suppressing of the Rebellion. The King in his Letter to the Assembly made suitable reply.

He graciously thanked the Church for "the fresh proofs you have given us, during the course of the late unhappy and unnatural Rebellion, of your firm adherence to these principles on which the security of our Government, and the happiness of our subjects do entirely depend".¹⁵⁰

The Rebellion had been suppressed. The fear and threat of invasion and conquest by the Pretender was over. The House of Hanover was securely upon the British Throne.

Whatever demands the future was to make upon the resources of the Church to establish Presbyterianism throughout the Highlands, which was her first and immediate task, she faced her responsibilities now with the firm renewal of assurance from the Crown of the King's "unalterable resolution" to maintain the established Government of the Church "in the full enjoyment of all its just rights and privileges".

¹⁵⁰ Acts of Assembly, 1716. The King's Letter to the General Assembly, 3rd May.

CHAPTER 6

THE DECISIVE YEARS

After the Rebellion of 1715 Presbyterianism was able to advance more rapidly into the Highland North. Its immediate task was to purge all Episcopalian-Jacobite influence from parish life, a task it pursued with great vigour. Episcopal intruders who had managed to hang on to their parishes were ruthlessly deposed. Disaffected schoolmasters were dismissed.

Support was sought from the Crown to defeat the menace of Barbarism, Disaffection and Popery in the Highlands and Islands, and the Royal Bounty granted.

The Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge played a vital role in this whole strategy. Its work, as it is recorded in the Society's Minutes, Reports and Anniversary Sermons, is reviewed. By 1760 the objects of Presbyterian policy had been achieved. The Church, as established at the Revolution, was now securely settled throughout the Highland North.

An Open Door to the North

Romish Error and Superstition

Schools and Schoolmasters

S.P.C.K. Anniversary Sermons

Assembly Sermons

AN OPEN DOOR TO THE NORTH

In September, 1716, Wodrow wrote a letter to the Rev. Robert Black, minister at Rotterdam,¹ giving him news of events in Scotland. "There is now an open door for planting the North", he writes, "more wide than we have had since the Revolution. The bulk of the intruders and incumbents there joined openly with the Pretender, and kept his fasts and thanksgivings, and are skulking up and down, and a good many of the gentlemen who stood in the way of planting churches are now retired or feigning subjection". He estimates that there are 36 vacancies in the Synod of Aberdeen to be filled immediately. This the Synod of Aberdeen set itself to do as soon as possible, but found itself balked in its actions against the intruders by the Tory Justices of the Peace,² who made out that they were not competent to deal with such ecclesiastical charges. They had to be brought to a proper sense of their duties by letters from the Advocate in Edinburgh.

The attitude of the Justices of the Peace reflected the dour, unbending Jacobitism still powerful in parish life in the North East. One of Wodrow's correspondents in Aberdeen, Mr. David Brown,³ says of many people in the Synod that they are "heart Jacobites". Describing the situation in many an Aberdeenshire parish, he writes "The Spirit of Jacobitism so much

¹Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. II. Letter LXI, p. 210

²Ibid., Letter LXVI, dated 20th November, 1717, p. 225.

³Ibid., Letter from Mr. David Brown, Aberdeen, dated 8th October, 1716, p. 210.

prevails with the people to this day, that when there are any vacancies whoever goes to preach, he is sure either of a well paid skin, or else gets the back of the churchyard dyke to preach at".

There remained, also, the problem to Church and State of the Jacobite University of Aberdeen. We find the Synod of Angus and Mearns in April, 1716,⁴ instructing its Commissioners to the General Assembly to press for the setting up of a Commission by the Government to deal with the University of Aberdeen. This was done, and a Commission of 21 members, with the Earl of Rothes as President, was appointed to investigate the loyalty of the professors at the two Colleges, King's and Marischal.

Wodrow writing about this Commission says⁵ - "In these two Colleges there are, except our professors, but one or two of the masters who have not been dipt in the Rebellion, and a clean house will be made". The clean house, which Wodrow hoped for, was made double sure by vesting the patronage of Marischal in the Crown.

In 1716, the immediate task of the Presbyteries in the North was to rid themselves of their intruders and incumbents who had supported the Rebellion. The thoroughness with which they set about this task is evident from a study of the Presbytery Records.

On 26th April, 1716, the Presbytery of Aberdeen⁶ met and

⁴Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Angus and Mearns, 20th April, 1716.

⁵Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. II. Letter LXI, p. 210.

⁶Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Aberdeen Presbytery, 26th April, 1716.

prepared libels against its intruders. These libels are in almost identical terms. We quote from the libel drawn up against Dr. Andrew Burnet, which shows clearly the nature of the charges brought against the intruders. Dr. Burnet was accused of intruding into one of the City Churches without any legal call or title, and of "engaging himself in the late unnatural and unjust rebellion against our only lawful and rightful sovereign, King George, in order to dethrone his Majesty, and overturn and destroy the Protestant succession in his Royal Family, and to advance a Popish Pretender to the throne of these realms, to the utter subversion of the true Protestant religion, with our laws and liberties".

The Presbytery had to deal also with a number of Episcopal ministers who had never been outed from their parishes, and who had stayed on under the protection of law. During the Rebellion ministers in this category had shown where their real loyalties lay and had supported the Pretender. Their libels varied accordingly. To illustrate this category of offence we quote from Mr. Richard Maitland's libel.⁷ "Mr. Richard Maitland having been incumbent in the Church of Nigg at the late happy Revolution, did pretend to have taken oaths to the Government and to have subscribed the Assurance and thereupon both continued to exercise the office of the holy ministry there,

⁷Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Aberdeen Presbytery, 16th May, 1716.

alleging the protection of law, yet nevertheless, it is veritie that the said Mr. Richard Maitland hath engaged himself in the late unnatural and unjust rebellion against our gracious and only rightful Sovereign, King George".

The Presbytery of Alford, meeting on 2nd May, 1716,⁸ dealt with a similar case, that of Mr. Livingstone, who had been incumbent at Keig. They dealt with three other cases of intrusion that day, but said about Mr. Livingston who had, of course, previously "sworn the Abjuration and Alledgiance, subscribed the Assurance, and prayed for his Majesty King George", and "had yet engaged in the Rebellion", that by his conduct he had given "greater scandall than his three brethren who had not qualified to the Government under Queen Anne". The intruders defended themselves against these charges on three grounds - (1) The Presbyteries had no authority over them, (2) The charges brought against them were civil charges, (3) It was not within the competence of the Presbytery to try them on such charges. The Presbyteries did not accept these pleas. It was maintained that ministers arraigned on such charges were guilty of spiritual offence as well as civil offence. They refused to allow them to play the one against the other, and deposed them.

Dunkeld Presbytery⁹ appointed a Committee to deal with its

⁸Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Alford Presbytery, 2nd May and 20th June, 1716; Also New Spalding Club, Extracts from Presbytery Records, p. 62-70.

⁹Ibid., Dunkeld Presbytery, 21st February and 22nd May, 1716

intruders whom it described as "having used the utmost endeavour to propagate disaffection to his Majesty's government". The nature of this disaffection soon becomes apparent from the Records - Mr. Duncan Stewart at Blair Athol "had had a great hand in influencing the people to rebellion in that country": Mr. George Robertson at Logierait "had upbraided the people for running away at Sheriffmuir": Mr. Robert Stewart at Mouline had "stirred up the people to rebellion by his sermon": Mr. John Pearson at Kirkmichael had "pressed people to take up arms against the Government and himself mounted on his horse with arms attended the Earl of Mar in his way from Kirkmichael to Mouline".

The Presbytery took action against eleven intruders all accused of the kind of disaffection instanced above. Libels were prepared, and after trial the eleven intruders were deposed. The Presbytery, also, laid a Representation of its Affairs before the Duke of Athole, the Sheriff principal of the Shire. Once again the strength of Jacobite sentiment in the parishes is indicated by a special report made to the Presbytery on the state of the parish of Cargill. The Report stresses that in this parish many people had been compelled to serve in the Rebellion under threat from their landlords and factors; and says, that such is their "aversion to the Government of our Sovereign King George and inclination to the Pretender and his friends that they cannot with patience hear anything in public worship tending to

the honour and interest of the first, or to the prejudice of the last". This "ill temper" the Presbytery attributes to the work of Popish priests and papists residing in the parish who enjoyed the protection of Mr. Thomas Crichton, Lord Drummond's factor.

The Presbytery, therefore, sends a special report on the situation at Cargill to be put before the Duke of Athole "in order to the remedying of the said grievances".

On 7th March, 1716, Brechin Presbytery¹⁰ dealt with its intruders, in all thirteen. Among them several gentlemen whom we have come across before - Mr. William Dunbar and Mr. Robert Auchterlony, who had been deprived of their former parishes at Conveth and Garvoch "by the Government for their Jacobitism": Mr. Gideon Guthrie and Mr. John Skinner, "formerly turned out by the Government and both of them lying under the sentence of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction for their former intrusions and other crimes": Mr. John Davie, "now chamberlain to the Earl of Southesk: Mr. Francis Rait, "who had attended Southesk at the Proclamation of the Pretender at Montrose": Mr. John Lammie, who "now keeps a meeting house at Foitlie, praying for the Pretender as before and endeavouring all he can to keep up the spirit of Jacobitism in the country"; Mr. Patrick Auchterlony, "now chamberlain to Panmure": and, Mr. Thomas Carstairs, "chaplain to the Laird of Grantully".

¹⁰Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Brechin Presbytery, 7th March, 1716.

During the months of March and April, 1716, the United Presbyteries of Dundee and Forfar tried and deposed all their intruders. Here the Episcopal ministers had organised themselves into two effective Presbyteries.¹¹ Each consisted of eight ministers. One met at Dundee, and the other at Forfar. They carried on all the functions of a Judicatory, exercised discipline, licensed men to preach, absolved from scandal, and were "at the utmost pains to break the legal congregations". Before the Rebellion these well organised Episcopal Presbyteries had been able to defy and disrupt the work of the legal Presbytery. They had maintained an effective discipline over their people, denying baptism and marriage to any who frequented the parish Kirk, making them profess public repentance for such misdemeanours, and requiring a solemn engagement from them that they would never "do the like for the future". The action taken in 1716 constituted a death blow to these Episcopal Presbyteries¹² and the hold of Jacobite lairds and ministers over their people was effectively broken.

The Records of the Presbyteries reveal in detail the action taken in parish after parish throughout the disaffected parts of the North to be rid once and for all of Episcopal incumbents and intruders, and to plant the North with a loyal Presbyterian

¹¹Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Dundee Presbytery, 21st April, 1714.

¹²Ibid., 28th March, 11th April, 4th April, 12th April, 1716.

ministry. It is in the Acts of the General Assembly, however, that we find the official declaration of the Church's resolve to "purge and plant kirks" throughout the Highlands and the North. To this end two Acts¹³ were passed in May, 1716; and a Commission was set up to visit individual parishes in the North and Highlands and to report on the state of affairs it found. The urgent need in the North was for ministers, especially ministers who had the Irish language. In 1716, Presbytery after Presbytery, Inverness, Ross, Dunkeld, Aberlour, Strathbogie, Brechin, Arbroath, petitioned the Assembly to send them Probationers who could speak the Irish tongue.¹⁴ The Assembly did its best to meet this immediate demand. The Index for 1716 lists the individual appointments made to several Presbyteries. Through the years this was a demand which was regularly repeated: one to which each Assembly gave considerable attention. "To purge and plant the North" is a theme running through the Assembly's Letters, Addresses, Acts and Instructions for many years to come.

In 1717, the Assembly passed an Act to encourage Collections throughout the parishes for the work of the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge.¹⁵ Apparently several parishes required a sharp reminder that they had failed to send in the money the

¹³Acts of Assembly, 1716, 14th May and 18th May, 1716

¹⁴Ibid., Index contains the Record of these Petitions.

¹⁵Ibid., 1717. Act 8th May, 1717.

Assembly of 1709 had recommended them to raise. This money had now to be raised and sent to George Watson, Merchant in Edinburgh, the Society's Treasurer.

This Assembly also took disciplinary action against several Probationers who had been ordered to serve in North, and who had failed to carry out the Assembly's instructions. They were referred to the Committee for the North for investigation.

More Probationers were ordered to the Northern Presbyteries. One was given a special grant of 400 merks yearly "to allow him to continue as preacher in the popish country of Glenlivet". And, most significantly, for the first time since the Revolution, the Assembly's instructions to the Commission contained no instruction that they were to assume Episcopal ministers of good life and doctrine.

This clause had been a permanent feature of these Instructions to the Commission, but the Rebellion of 1715 and the support it received from the Episcopal party made it quite impossible for the Established Church to regard Episcopal ministers as being in any sense "of good life and doctrine".

It is interesting to note, also, that while the Assembly stopped its instructions to the Commission on the assumption of Episcopal ministers, the Private Instructions to the Commissioner to the General Assembly contained the following article until the year 1744:

"You are to encourage any inclinations you find in the Assembly to assume to their Government such of the ministers as have preached under Bishops and are now qualified by law whom they shall find to be pious and moderate men and to have behaved themselves as they ought during the Rebellions".¹⁶

The reason given in the State Papers for the omission of this instruction in 1744 was, simply: "There are no ministers in this category". The same reason could have been advanced in 1717. Either the Secretary of State was singularly ill informed about the relationship between the Established Church and the Episcopalians in 1717, or he was incredibly optimistic. Whatever the reason this instruction to the Commissioner from 1717 onwards was, as far as the Assembly was concerned, a dead letter.

ROMISH ERROR AND SUPERSTITION

In 1722, the problem of Popery and Disaffection to Church and State was made the subject of a Humble Address to the King.¹⁷ In the remoter parts of the Highlands Roman Catholic seminaries had been opened publicly for the education of youth in "Romish error and superstition". By itself this was bad enough; but the Assembly went on to remind the King that from these seminaries "the cleverst boys are taken overseas for further instruction in these pernicious and damnable doctrines, which are equally

¹⁶ State Papers, Register House, Edinburgh. Church Books, 56, Vol. 2, p. 61

¹⁷ Acts of Assembly, 1722. Humble Address to the King, dated 18th May, 1722.

dangerous to our holy religion, and the foundations of your Majesty's government". "When they are fully poisoned with the principles of idolatry and arbitrary power, many of them clothed with the character of priesthood, do return into your Majesty's dominions, and exercise the utmost power and diligence, in perverting your Majesty's subjects from the true Reformed Protestant Faith, and from that loyalty and affection to your Majesty, which love to liberty, and a due regard to the peace of their country, ought to engage them to promote".

There can be little doubt about the serious view the Assembly took of these events in the North. To combat the menace of Popery and Disaffection it was sending into the North all the men and money it could raise. The situation was not one, however, which the Church could deal with by itself. It required "effectual and speedy remedy" by the Government. That year, this was the urgent request contained in the Address to the King.

They warn the King of the traitorous designs of many of his undutiful subjects in the North, "who plot with traitors abroad to raise a rebellion in Great Britain". These traitorous conspiracies they put down to Popish influence and Romish emissaries. They draw the King's attention to the "absolute inconsistency that is betwixt the Romish tenets, and those principles upon which our present establishment in Church and State is founded".

They send a full account of the activities of the Romish agents in the North to the Secretary of State for Scotland, and complaint about the "inactivity of inferior Judges in executing the laws against Popery." They condemn the attitude of "inexcusable Protestants"¹⁸ who connive at these Romish activities: "Who cannot but perceive, that as the security of our religion and liberty does, under God, in the strongest manner depend upon the safety of your Majesty's Person and Government, so the increase in Popery is a proper step towards the endangering of both".

The Assembly ended this Address with a firm declaration that "No fear of violence or secret wicked attempts whatsoever" would ever divert them from their "inviolable loyalty" to the Crown; and, they renewed the declaration of their resolve to impress upon the minds of their people the principles of true religion and affection to his Majesty's person and interests.

Next year we find the Assembly instructing the Commission "to pitch upon fit persons to be employed as preachers and catechists in the bounds of the Presbyteries of Strathbogie,

18

Acts of Assembly, 1723. Humble Address to the King, dated 11th May, 1723: This Address also contains scathing references to "such as call themselves Protestants ... and have designed to destroy your Majesty": The Humble Address of 1728 contains similar sentiments.

Abernethy and Lorn".¹⁹ These men were to provide an itinerant ministry in the North: they were to travel from house to house, and instruct people in the principles of true religion, and a sum of 400 merks yearly was to be allowed to each man engaged in this work.

Again, while the Church undertook this work out of its own resources the need for financial assistance was urgent. The Commission was, therefore, instructed to address the Government for "a suitable yearly fund to maintain more itinerant catechists and preachers in those countries where Popery abounds".

By the year, 1724, the Assembly was able to strengthen the establishment of Presbyterianism in the North by the creation of four new Presbyteries. The parishes of Glenelg, Kintail, Lochailsh, Lochcarron, Gairloch, Lochbroom and Assint, became the Presbytery of Gairloch. Kilmalie in Lochaber, Kilmonivaig, Abertarff, Laggan, Urquhart and Glenmoriston, became the Presbytery of Abertarff. The parishes in Skye were made into two Presbyteries, and the four Presbyteries thus created were erected into the Synod of Glenelg.²⁰

By this creation the advance of Presbyterianism into the North West was secured, but it should be noted that this point

¹⁹ Acts of Assembly, 1723. Overtures

²⁰ Acts of Assembly, 1724. Act Erecting the Synod of Glenelg, 19th May, 1724: Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 63. "Synod of Glenelg" by T. M. Murchison.

was not reached until 35 years after the Revolution had taken place. The establishment of these Presbyteries did not mean that the North and West had been won over to Presbytery and Crown, it only meant that the Church now had a settled legal establishment upon which to build all its efforts in the years to come to defeat the Popery and Disaffection which largely dominated these areas still.

Large numbers of students having the Irish language had to be recruited to the ministry of the Church in order to establish a permanent settled parish ministry in the bounds of the new Presbyteries. We find the Assembly of 1724 concerning itself with these urgent matters:- the provision of bursaries for students having the Irish language; and the sending of letters to the Sheriffs of Argyle, Ross, Banff, Murray, Aberdeen and Inverness, "intreating them to give their assistance in the punctual execution" of the laws against "Priests, Jesuits and Trafficking Papists".

The Synods of Murray, Aberdeen, Argyll and Glenelg were instructed to "keep a correspondence together and visit their parishes where it was known that the teachers of the new doctrine were at work, and assist the ministers there "to remedy these evils".

Help was sought, also, from the Lowlands. The Commission was instructed to "get some ministers from the South to join

with and assist their brethren in the North".²¹ Care was taken, however, that only those of proved loyalty were sent as ministers into the disaffected areas. We find the Assembly in 1725 preventing the settlement of Mr. Archibald Muir,²² called the "Moorcock", in what Wodrow describes as "a Jacobite country", although he had the support of patron and people. Wodrow says that this popular consent was brought about through "malignant and Jacobite influence" and that it was his deposition for Jacobitism "that recommended him".

In 1725, the Crown, at last, took action which showed that the appeals of several Assemblies for help to deal with the menace of Popery and Disaffection in the Highlands and Islands had not fallen on deaf ears. Through his Commissioner the King was pleased to inform the Assembly that he intended to set up a Royal Bounty Fund²³ to aid in "putting a stop to the spread of ignorance and prophaneness and the trafficking of Popish priests and emissaries in the Highlands and Islands". The Assembly

²¹Acts of Assembly, 1724. Index, Instructions to Commission of Assembly.

²²Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. III, p. 205. Letter to Mrs. Wodrow, 19th May, 1725; Fasti, I, 363, Rev. A. Muir.

²³Acts of Assembly, 1725. King's Letter to General Assembly, 6th May, 1725: Assembly's Answer to King's Letter, 8th May: Commission to some Ministers and Ruling Elders, for Reformation of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, and for management of the King's Bounty for that end: Index contains Petitions from Highland Presbyteries for assistance from King's Bounty.

directed that this money should be used "for the encouragement of the Synod of Glenelg, for the suppressing of Popery there, and to allow ministers, preachers and catechists to travel in the foresaid bounds".

The Assembly Records show the tremendous impetus this Royal Gift gave to the work of the Church in the Highlands and the North. Petitions pour in for help from parish after parish, and the Assembly appoints/permanent Committee for the Management of the King's Bounty.²⁴

The granting of the King's Bounty gave more than financial assistance to the Church. It gave the moral assurance that the Government was as well aware as the Church of the serious menace the Highlands and Islands still held for the future security of Church and State in Scotland. It supported completely every effort made by the Church to root out Popery and Disaffection from the North.

In 1727, the Assembly considered it necessary to Address the King²⁵ again on the subject of the Highlands and Islands. In this Address they pay particular attention to the menace of Episcopalianism. They claim that the non Juring, pretended, Protestant Bishops, and those they put in orders, are sowing the seeds of disaffection to the Government. "These preachers do not only not pray for the King", but on the contrary they pray

²⁴ Acts of Assembly, 1725. Index. Petitions from the Presbyteries of Longisland and Caithness, and from the Parishes of Kilmalie in Lochaber and Kiltartie.

²⁵ Ibid., 1727. Humble Address to the King, 19th May, 1727.

in terms by which their hearers understand that none else can be meant but the Pretender", and "take every opportunity to insinuate into their minds, that they are oppressed under your Majesty's administration, and can have no prospect of redress, but from his success".

There was, however, only one way to deal with the menace of Popery or Jacobite Episcopalianism in the Highlands - that was to build up steadily the agencies of the Church throughout the parishes. In 1727, the Report of the Committee for the Reformation of the Highlands and Islands²⁶ shows that during the previous year - Nine Ministers, 24 Probationers and 27 Catechists had been sent to "places where Popery and Ignorance most abound"; and 390 copies of the Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms in Irish had been distributed to those Presbyteries "where that language is spoke".

On the Accession of George II the Assembly sounded a more confident note in its Humble Address to the new King.²⁷ It is their "reasonable hope" that "the abjured Pretender will soon have no friend in Britain, who is not likewise a friend to his absurd religion". They express the hope that under God, their own efforts will meet with success both against him and against "those errors that lead captive his blinded abettors into his

²⁶ Acts of Assembly, 1727. Index. Report of Committee for the Reformation of the Highlands and Islands.

²⁷ Ibid., 1728. Humble Address of the Commission of the General Assembly.

interest against their own".

Year by year the business of the Assembly shows how step by step the parish life of the people in the North was being made more secure against the influence of the Pretenders advocates in the North. Presbyteries and Synods petition the Assembly for help in the erecting of new charges, or to gain possession of glebes or manses which unwilling heritors refused to provide, or for itinerant ministers and catechists to be provided for out of the Royal Bounty Funds.

Of particular interest is the case of the parish of Ardnamurchan.²⁸ In 1728 the Presbytery of Lorn²⁹ presented a petition relating to the parish of Ardnamurchan. It was a large and unwieldy parish, they claimed, and required more ministerial supervision than one minister could possibly give. The same year the Synod of Argyll noted that the people of Ardnamurchan are "for the most part of different principles from the Church of Scotland". Ten years later, the Presbytery of Lorn still records that its inhabitants were "mostly papist, and the rest highfliers, disaffected to Church and State".

In 1739, the minister of Ardnamurchan, Mr., Lauchlan Campbell,³⁰ again petitions the Assembly "setting forth the circumstances of his parish". He desires that the Royal Bounty

²⁸ Acts of Assembly, 1728, Index.

²⁹ Lorn Presbytery Records, 1728; Craven, Diocese of Argyll, 295.

³⁰ Acts of Assembly, 1739. Index: In the Index, 1741, a similar petition sets out the differences betwixt the Laird of McKinan and the Minister of Strath.

itinerant minister be continued: he craves that another catechist be settled among his people; he wishes also to petition the Sheriff of Inverness "to grant a deputation to some fit person to act as Judge in that remote part of his jurisdiction" for the encouragement of Protestants, and in order to carry on the necessary legal processes for the adequate provision and accommodation of the minister of Ardnamurchan according to law.

Ardnamurchan is typical of many a parish throughout the North and West of Scotland at this time, but it has its own unique place in the history of Jacobitism. It was from this parish that news of the Prince's landing in Scotland was first sent to Edinburgh, by no less a person than the parish minister, Mr. Lauchlan Campbell.

On 4th August, 1745 Mr. Campbell³¹ preached a sermon which, he says, greatly excited his hearers. "I do not think you are ready to rebel", he told them, "but if you do, beware you do not meet with Absalom's fate". He was warned by one of his Jacobite heritors after the service: "Do not preach in yon style again, else beware the consequences". That night he learned that the Pretender had landed. Mr. Campbell immediately informed the Duke of Argyle's factor, Campbell of Auchindown, who notified the Sheriff of the Shire, and the all important news was on the first stage of its journey South.

³¹ Sir James Fergusson, Argyll in the Forty Five, p. 11; Scottish Historical Review, Vol. XXIII, W. B. Blaikie, p. 165-7.

If the struggle to root out Popery and Disaffection from the parishes in the Highlands was prolonged it was not without its moments of highlighted drama. Such an event occurred in 1729, when the House of Gordon ceased to identify itself with Roman Catholicism. A letter was received by the Assembly from the Duchess of Gordon³² in which she declared "her profession of the true reformed religion", and "her zeal for advancing of it".

The Assembly marked this occasion not only by writing to the Duchess herself, but also to her father, the Earl of Peterborough, the Earl of Aberdeen, and other friends of the noble house of Gordon, signifying to them the Assembly's great satisfaction at the assurances they had been given, that all the children of that noble House were to be educated in the principles of the Reformed Protestant Religion, in loyalty to his Majesty King George, and good affection to the Protestant succession in his Royal Family.

Remembering the militant Jacobitism of the Old Duchess, her presentation of the 'Reddite Medal' to the Faculty of Advocates in 1711,³³ and her protection of Roman priests in her lodgings in

³² Acts of Assembly, 1730. Index. Letter to her Grace the Duchess of Gordon.

³³ Lambeth Palace Library MSS. Vol XIII, No. 27. An Account of a Gold Medal of the Pretender sent as a present to the Faculty of Advocates at Edinburgh by the Duchess of Gordon, and what passed thereupon at a Meeting of the said Faculty, dated July 26th, 1711, and directed to Sir Richard Farrington, M.P; Omond, Lord Advocates of Scotland, p. 291-2, Minutes of the Faculty 17-18th July, 1711; Menray, Life and Letters of Duncan Forbes of Culloden, p. 17; Tayler, A. & H., 1716 The Story of the Rising p. 219, for Elizabeth, Duchess of Gordon.

the Canongate as late as 1722, the attitude of the new Duchess represented a change of great significance. Its consequences were felt throughout Gordon territory. Where once parishes had been haunted by trafficking priests, and considerable resistance shown to the settlement of catechists or ministers we now find the Duke of Gordon writing to ask the Assembly that two itinerant preachers be employed within his domains.³⁴ (1738).

No less a triumph in this struggle to secure the Highland North for Presbyterianism was the reception by the Assembly in 1735 of Mr. James Tyrie,³⁵ who had worked for several years as a Popish priest in the North. He had publicly renounced the errors of Popery, signed the Confession of Faith, and had been received into the Communion of the Church of Scotland by the Synod of Murray. In 1735 he appeared before the Assembly, was exhorted to promote the interests of the Protestant religion and was sent North to minister "in such places where Popery abounds".

In Angus and Mearns where the Earls of Panmure and Southesk had raised their tenants in the Fifteen Rebellion their estates passed into the hands of the Forfeited Estates Commissioners. In this way the influence of the old Jacobite landlords was broken, and the legal settlement of Churches and Kirk Sessions

³⁴ Acts of Assembly, 1738. Index. Letter from the Duke of Gordon

³⁵ Acts of Assembly, 1735. Index. Case of Mr. James Tyrie; Fasti, VII, 252. Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Abertarff Presbytery, 19th October, 1742. Move of Mr. Tyrie to Orkney.

went on without resistance. In Glenesk³⁶ for instance, there was no legal manse for the minister, so he lived with the factor of the York Building Society in Invermark Castle until a manse was built. A state of affairs that would have been unthinkable before 1715.

In this part of Angus, too, John Row³⁷ was minister of the parish of Navar and Lethnot. He began his ministry among strongly Jacobite parishioners and ministered among them faithfully until his death in 1745. Two years later a memorial was erected to him at Lethnot, which reads: "He died upon the 24th day of December, 1745, while the nation was distracted with civil wars, but had the pleasure to see his people adhering to their religion and liberties, while many others had joined those who wanted to overthrow both".

SCHOOLS AND SCHOOLMASTERS

Next to the importance of establishing a Kirk and a minister in disaffected areas in the Highlands and the North was the necessity of providing in the parish schools schoolmasters whose loyalty to Church and Government was beyond suspicion.

In parish life the schoolmaster was an ecclesiastical personage second only to the minister. He was approved and appointed by the Presbytery. He was the precentor in Church on

³⁶ Jervise, A., Land of the Lindsays, p. 75

³⁷ Ibid., p. 128; Fasti, Part VI, p. 833 (1871 Edition)

Sundays and clerk to the Session. He had, perhaps, an even more formative influence upon the youth of the parish than the minister himself. He was almost as deeply responsible for the spiritual well being of the parish as the minister, and from his position as schoolmaster he might hope to be advanced to be minister of a parish of his own. One of the chief tasks of the Presbyteries, therefore, after the Rebellion was to purge out thoroughly their disaffected schoolmasters.

The Presbytery Records show that meticulous care was taken in dealing with these schoolmasters. Libels were drawn up against them, witnesses called, and appeals from Presbytery to Synod allowed, before a final sentence of deposition was read.

A study of the Presbytery Records makes perfectly clear the kind of influence the disaffected schoolmasters had exercised upon their pupils, and upon the community at large.

Mr. John Petrie, the schoolmaster at Brechin,³⁸ for instance, had given his scholars a holiday to mark the landing of the Pretender, and had encouraged them to come to the Church for a Thanksgiving, and had said: "God in his good Providence, had now through many difficulties and dangers, brought the King to his own domains".

Mr. Spence and Mr. Sime, masters at the Grammar School at Montrose, had both taken the oaths of Allegiance and subscribed the Assurance, but had left the Church at Montrose where Queen

³⁸ Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Brechin Presbytery, 15th March, 1716.

Anne and King George were prayed for, and had taken their scholars to the local Meeting House, where they were not prayed for.

On 30th April, 1716, the Presbytery of Dundee³⁹ dealt with three of its schoolmasters, Mr. Patrick Greenhill at Longforgan, Mr. James Wylie at Murrose, and Mr. Patrick Lyon at Dundee. Mr. Lyon's case was dealt with at some length. Among other charges he was accused of having signed the Confession of Faith and of failing to uphold its principles; of having taught his scholars a catechism never allowed by this Church; of having deserted the communion of this Church, and by his example encouraged the youth to do likewise; of having joined a schismatical meeting house and officiating there as an elder; and of having joined with the preachers who prayed expressly for the Pretender during the time of the Rebellion, although he himself had taken the oath of Abjuration.

During the months of September and October, 1716, the Presbytery of Perth,⁴⁰ dealt with its disaffected schoolmasters. Where they had refused to sign the Confession of Faith, or attend public worship, or had shown themselves friendly to the rebels during the rebellion, they were removed from office. The Presbytery expressed the gravest reasons for so doing: "It was

³⁹Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Dundee Presbytery, 30th April, 1716.

⁴⁰Ibid., Perth Presbytery, 5th September, 19th September, 3rd October., and 11th October, 1716.

highly dangerous to entrust such persons with the instruction of youth any longer".

On 17th October the ministers of Forgandenny and Forteviot⁴¹ presented to the Presbytery a Representation concerning the necessity for schools in their parishes. Although lying within 2 or 3 miles of Perth the parish of Forteviot had no legal school: all the efforts of previous ministers having been resisted by the heritors. The river Earn cut the parish in two, and in winter time could not be crossed by pupils going to school. Since there was no legal schoolmaster there was, therefore, no precentor or session clerk, which was "a great disadvantage to the minister". And the report adds: "that of all the parts of the said parish there is none so pestered with disaffected persons as that very place about the Church at Forteviot". The ministers were also concerned about the part of the parish which lay in the Ochil hills about 4 or 5 miles distant from the Church, and which, "by reason of the distance, mountains and waters interjected" has no communication with other parts of the parish. Although they cannot say that there have been many papists or disaffected persons residing in the Ochil bounds, they were anxious about the "interest that disaffected gentlemen have there", and were afraid that these bounds were "as much in hazard of being pestered with such persons as any other place in this Presbytery."

⁴¹ Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Perth Presbytery, 17th October, 1716.

Dunkeld, Dundee, Dunoon, Perth, Elgin, Angus and Mearns, and Moray Records,⁴² all provide ample evidence of the struggle that went on between the Church authorities and reluctant heritors over the provision of legal schools in the Highland parishes. In 1719 the Assembly passed an Act⁴³ declaring the absolute necessity of providing a legal school in every parish.

In the task of providing schools throughout the Disaffected North due place should be given to the work done by the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge. After the Fifteen Rebellion the General Assembly gave increased encouragement and support to this Society. If the provision of legal schools was to prove a difficult business, part of the remedy was to increase steadily the number of Charity Schools in the Highland parishes. Accordingly, in 1716, the Assembly passed an Act for furthering the Pious Designs of the Society.⁴⁴

The views of the Society about the situation in the Highlands are set forth in its Petition⁴⁵ to the Assembly the same year: "We think this late Insurrection has given a convincing evidence, how hurtful the rudeness and ignorance of the common

⁴²Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Dunkeld Presbytery, 10th July, 1716; Dundee Presbytery, 28th March, 1716; Dunoon Presbytery, 10th October, 1716; Perth Presbytery, 25th November, 1716; Synod of Angus and Mearns, 20th April, 1716; Synod of Moray, 25th April, 1716.

⁴³Acts of Assembly, 1719. Act for Preventing the Growth of Popery, for Encouragement of Ministers and the Settlement and Provision of Schools.

⁴⁴Ibid., 1716. Act for furthering the pious Design of the Society for propagating Christian Knowledge.

⁴⁵Ibid., Petition from the Society to the General Assembly, 7th May, 1716.

people in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland has proven, and may yet prove to the commonwealth, if care be not taken to cure it. For it is obvious that this did, and will still make them fit tools in the hands of their Popish or Jacobite chieftains and landlords, for carrying on their rebellious projects of overturning our happy constitution".

This document was in the nature of a rallying cry. All men of goodwill must be brought to the immediate and generous support of this venture: "It is hoped that all true lovers of our holy religion, and of their King and Country, will need no other argument to induce them cheerfully and liberally to contribute to so noble and Christian an undertaking than this, to make a poor rude and ignorant people, now dangerous and hurtful to the nation, profitable members of the commonwealth".

Next year the Assembly passed an Act⁴⁶ pressing upon ministers and parishes their urgent duty to raise funds to provide for the schemes of the Society. Two years later the Society⁴⁷ was able to inform the Assembly that they planned to erect instantly 42 schools in those parts of the Highlands and Islands as appeared to them to stand in most need of their assistance.

⁴⁶ Acts of Assembly, 1717. Act and Recommendation for the further encouragement of the Society for propagating Christian Knowledge, and bringing in the Collections for buying Books, 8th May, 1717.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 1719. Representation of the Society in Scotland for propagating Christian Knowledge, with an Act thereupon, 19th May, 1719.

The Society had, also, to inform the Assembly that it did not have sufficient resources to meet the increasing demands made upon it for new schools, and successfully petitioned the Assembly to provide it with grants from the "Funds of the Equivalent". The Assembly had intended to use this Fund to maintain Probationers whom they hoped to be able to send into the Highland parishes to be used as Catechists. The Society argued most convincingly that this work could be done better by employing the Society's schoolmasters as Catechists. They stressed the following facts:- Usually the Charity school was established in a part of the parish some distance from the Church, where the schoolmaster could conduct public worship on Sunday. In summer, for instance, he went with the people to the sheilings and moved about among them. He was, therefore, a more permanent part of their community than a Probationer-Catechist could ever hope to become.

Since the Assembly was unable to find sufficient Probationers having the Irish language to fill the existing ministerial vacancies, it very wisely received and supported this petition.

The Society's Minutes, Annual Reports and Anniversary Sermons provide a very clear indication of the determination which was shown by both the Church and the Society to set up Charity Schools throughout the Highlands and Islands.

The Society wrote to the Presbyteries asking them to give an indication of the number of Schools they considered necessary within their bounds.

In September, 1716, Dunkeld Presbytery⁴⁸ considered a report

⁴⁸Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Dunkeld Presbytery, 22nd August, 1716.

which dealt with the needs of the Presbytery parish by parish and set out "the places in the Highlands of Athole and the adjacent country where schools are wanting". They also attested their satisfaction with the work of the Charity schoolmaster at Blair Athole⁴⁹ whose school was attended "by upward of thirty scholars".

The Synod of Angus and Mearns,⁵⁰ considering the Society's letter recommended that 8 schools be set up "in the Highland parts of the bounds, in what were considered to be some of the most disaffected parishes: Fetteresso, the west glens of Fordoun, Lethnot and Edzell, Glenprosin and Clova."

The views of the Society on the influence of Clan chiefs and lairds upon Highland life is contained in a Memorial on the subject in the Minutes of 7th June, 1716:-

"Many of the heads of clans, especially Popish ones, do discourage learning in their countrys, because it would draw off the people from that unlimited subjection paid to them. Nothing can be more effectual for reducing these countrys to order, and making them useful to the commonwealth than teaching them their duty to God, their King and Country, and rooting out their Irish language, and this has been the care of the Society so far as they could, for all the scholars are taught in English. And none are allowed to be masters in the Societys Charity Schools, but such as produce sufficient certificates of their piety, knowledge and loyalty".⁵¹

The Minutes of 7th June, also record a number of letters from ministers in the Highlands and Islands, Durness, Lairg,

⁴⁹Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Dunkeld Presbytery, 4th September, 1716.

⁵⁰Ibid., Synod of Angus and Mearns, 20th April, 1716.

⁵¹Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Minutes, Vol. I, 7th June, 1716 (Register House).

Gairloch, and other places in Ross, Sutherland, and the shires of Murray and Aberdeen, telling of the hindrance the late Rebellion had caused to the work of the Charity Schools. It was recorded that apart from the behaviour of the Society's schoolmasters at Braemar and Balquidder "all the Societys other schoolmasters did carrie right during the late Rebellion".⁵²

By 1718, some letters telling of the success of the new schools begin to reach the Society. Mr. Chisholm, of the parish of Kilmorack,⁵³ sent in a list of scholars attending the Charity school in his parish. This was the first school that had been set up in the parish since the Reformation, and he records that both "private gentlemen" and "the body of the common people" are very fond of the Society's School. His view was that, "it has already reconciled them to the Government both of Church and State".

The same Minute shows that the school at Braemar had recovered some of the ground lost during the Rebellion. The schoolmaster there reported that he had a great number of scholars in his school again, and that the Laird of Invercauld was maintaining 5 bursars at the school, (in the strongly disaffected parish of Glenlivet). A report from the Presbytery of Aberlour showed that the school was flourishing, having a total of 49 scholars, of which 31 were children of Popish parents.

The parish of Ardnamurchan,⁵⁴ "at least 40 miles long and

⁵²Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, Minutes, Vol. I, 7th June, 1716 (Register House)

⁵³Ibid., Vol. II, 11th March, 1718 (Register House)

⁵⁴Ibid., 5th November, 1719 (Register House)

30 miles broad", "the largest half thereof being all papists" was considered in November 1719. The Committee resolved that as soon as it had sufficient funds it would consider the needs of Ardnamurchan and Tiree. At the same time the Presbytery of Lorn placed before the Society the requirements of "5 large countries", Moidart, Arisaig, Morhir, Ardnamurchan and Lunard, "the first three being all popish, and the other two vastly scattered where are three or four preaching places, two of them five miles distance and the third at 24 miles distance of unrideable ground".

A Charity school was asked for in Strathdon⁵⁵ by the Presbytery of Alford in 1720. They stressed that there was great need for a School at the head of the parish, which was situated about 5 miles from the Church "where was a strong Irish speaking community of some 380 persons, among whom were many papists, and more in danger of being perverted".

A letter from a schoolmaster to the Society in 1720 gives some indication of the type of scholar attending the Charity schools. He mentions scholars remaining at school until they are men "of about 20 years of age", even the children of popish parents to this age, and hopes that as a result they might be "in a fair way to renounce the popish errors". He obviously

⁵⁵ Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Minutes, Vol. II, 12th March, 1720 (Register House)

does not work in his school among the children of popish parents without some opposition, for he mentions that priests are at work in the parish and are at great pains to persuade popish parents to take their children away from his school, by spreading about the story that the Government "is breeding them to send them to the plantations". He adds: "the poor people are so credulous that its not easie to undeceive them as to this".

The same year the Society tried to gain, without success, a grant of £20,000 from the Forfeited Estates to help in maintaining its schools.

In 1726, the Presbytery of Abertarff sent a petition to the Society to have a charity school erected in the strongly Jacobite parish of Glenmoriston.⁵⁶ People there, it appears, had become "very sensible of their disadvantage in not knowing the Scriptures", and now desired that both they and their children should be educated. They lived so far from the parish Church at Urquhart that the minister there could seldom visit them. The result was that they were "in little better circumstances than the natives in America". It was estimated that only 4 out of 400 catechisable persons in Glenmoriston could read. The parish school was situated some 8 miles away, and some very rapid and unfordable waters hindered the children from giving regular attendance at the school. Glenmoriston would appear to be among the worst of the parishes the Society was asked to help. Yet little appears to have been achieved there. Thirty years later a special

⁵⁶Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Minutes, Vol. II, 3rd November, 1726 (Register House)

Report⁵⁷ was presented again to the Society on the situation at Glenmoriston. It makes very dismal reading.

There is no religion there but Popery. Out of a thousand persons in the glen not above forty were able to read and write. There was no school. There was no means of education whatsoever except what was provided by the Roman priests. "Whose business it was", the Report adds, "to corrupt their minds more and more, both to civil and religious principles".

The consequence of the failure of school and church in Glenmoriston can be easily seen. To a man the people of Glenmoriston engaged in the Rebellion of 1745.

By 1730, however, the Society's schools numbered 107, and looked after nearly 4,000 scholars. The Anniversary sermon that year mentions the "very satisfying accounts from Presbyteries", and gentlemen in the Highlands, "showing what a considerable alteration to the better these schools have made".⁵⁸

In 1748, the Society published an Account of its "Rise, Progress and Present State". The number of schools had risen to 134, in which 5,805 pupils⁵⁹ were being taught. It was estimated "At the lowest computation" that in the 40 years of its existence the Society had provided for the education in its

⁵⁷ Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. State of the Society, 1756, p. 44.

⁵⁸ Ibid., Anniversary Sermon, 5th January, 1730. Rev. J. Mattison, p. 22.

⁵⁹ S.P.C.K., A Short Account of the Rise, Progress and Present State of the Society (with a Sermon by the Rev. Robert Walker) 1748, p. 56

Charity schools of some fifty thousand children throughout the Highlands and Islands.

The Short Account has something to say also about the causes of the recent Rebellion. It noted that the prime movers in it came from those remote parts of the Highlands "where the Society's influence had scarce reached".⁶⁰ Their religion was either Popery or Paganism: their clanships were slavish to the last degree; their chiefs were not amenable to justice; feudal rights still operated with severity, while "Rome pests them with her priests", and "the Pretender with his agents"⁶¹ but the Society is optimistic about the future of the Highlands: "Their conversion is possible, tho' it must be owned 'tis extremely difficult".

It lists, too, some recent successes in rooting out Popery in such places as Strathglass, Braemar, Enzie, Glenlivet, and other places in the shires of Aberdeen and Murray, but it notes that "these very assiduous creatures, the priests, are again buzzing about, and doing all they can to pervert and seduce his Majesty's subjects from the principles of the Protestant religion, and of loyalty to his Majesty's person and Government".⁶²

In several places, however, the Society claims little success - Ardnamurchan, Arisaig, Morhir, Egg, Cana, South Uist

⁶⁰Short Account, p. 54.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 50.

⁶²Ibid., p. 56.

and Bara. There, it has to be admitted, Popery still prevails.⁶³

In the Minute Book of the Society, for 19th March, 1747, there occurs this interesting entry:-

"Reported that the Secretary to the Society's Correspondents at London having got inspection of certain Papers of Correspondence betwixt the Popish emissaries placed in the countrys of Mochir, Arisaig, Moldart, and their constituents at Rome, in which several pieces of useful intelligence are discovered. Particularly the number of Papists in the West of Scotland, which they compute to be about 9,000 examinable persons, and these emissaries much complain of the hurt done their cause by this Society, and the Managers of the King's Bounty.

"That the said papers were lately seized by the Argyleshire militia, when in quest of rebels through these countrys. That the Committee are corresponding with Mr. Anderson upon the expediency of printing and publishing some part of the intelligence got by these Papers so far as the same may be judged for the publick good and promote the design of this Society".

These were the "Morar Papers" which had been discovered by troops during their search for Lord Lovat. The Society published them in 1748. In addition to the "intelligence" sent back to "their constituents at Rome the Papers included an "Address to All Churchmen and honourable Catholick Gentlemen in the Highlands". Although it is dated 1731 its contents had, apparently, never been made public. It conveyed the news of the appointment of Hugh Macdonald of Morar to be the new Bishop and Apostolic Delegate in the Highlands; and contained this significant sentence - "With

⁶³ Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Minutes. Vol. 4, 4th June, 1747. (Register House)

the consent, and at the desire of our Sovereign, James".⁶⁴

Finally, the 1748 Account deals with the Society's policy of rooting out the Irish Language.⁶⁵ It claims that of all methods tried in the Society's schools this is the one which is expected to prove most successful.. Although later Gaelic historians, Maclean and McInnes, condemn this policy utterly, there is no doubt from the evidence of the Minutes that it was unanimously supported at the time.

Other methods had been tried in the attempt to civilize the Highlands; disarming the clans, prohibiting Highland dress, proscribing clan names; but no attempt had been made to change its language. If this barrier could be broken down, there was every hope of being able to root out completely Highland barbarity, ignorance, disaffection and popery. For "nothing tends to perpetuate barbarity and ignorance among them more than this very thing, which renders it impossible to learn of the rest of the world or the rest of the world to understand them". Or so the Society claimed.

⁶⁴ SPCK. A Short Account of the Rise, Progress and Present State of the Society, 1748, p. 57-61; SPCK Minutes, Vol. 4 19th March, 1747. For Account of the Roman Mission under Bishops Nicolson and Gordon, see - Bellesheim, IV, p. 186; Maclean, Counter Reformation, p. 196-264.

⁶⁵ SPCK. Minutes, 13th June, 1716, 11th February 1720, 26th May, 1726 and 18th January, 1753 refer to this policy. The Minutes, 5th January, 1766 record the change of policy. Sermon preached at opening of General Assembly 23rd May, 1754, by Alexander Webster, p. 24. Deals with disarming of the Clans, change of dress etc. and stresses the necessity for changing their language, "the stronghold of ignorance and rebellion".

This theory was pursued with great vigour until eventually experience proved its futility. Not until 1766 was it changed, and the Society's schoolmasters "enjoined to teach their scholars to read both Erse and English".

S.P.C.K. ANNIVERSARY SERMONS

Between 1745 and 1760 the Society's Anniversary Sermons were preached by a succession of the most eminent Presbyterian Divines of the day. These Sermons, and the various Accounts of the State of the Society which were published from time to time, provide a great deal of most significant comment on the problems which the Church faced in the Highlands.

The 1746 sermon, not unexpectedly, dealt with the subject of religious and political tyranny. "This Rebellion", the preacher said, "owes its rise and progress to ignorance and superstition, it began in the most ignorant, wild and barbarous parts of our country", and "has been supported by the most ignorant and superstitious of our countrymen". "Without the Highland Clans there would have been no Rebellion at all, and the Highland Clans would never have engaged in it, had they not been ignorant and superstitious, ill instructed and uncivilized". "Should we not, therefore, even for our own sakes, support a Society for the Reformation of these Highland Clans, when we have seen and felt that they are capable of doing so much mischief".⁶⁶

⁶⁶ Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Anniversary Sermon, 1746, Rev. R. Wallace, p. 11, 27-37

In the 1748 sermon an attempt was made to spiritualize the Rebellion in the interests of the Gospel. Mr. Walker used the issues of the Forty Five Rising to illustrate man's spiritual rebellion against God. "Let us, then, my brethren, throw down the weapons of our rebellion, and yield ourselves to this Gracious Sovereign, and then the increase of His power shall become the matter of our joy:- Let us invite Him into our hearts, and erect a throne for Him there:- Let us secure to ourselves a title to the protection and privileges of His government, by submitting to the laws and constitution of it:- Let us beseech Him to cast down everything that would exalt itself against His authority, and to take the full and perpetual possession of our souls".⁶⁷

In 1752 the Anniversary sermon was preached by the Rev. John Bonar of Cockpen. He reminded the Society that it was religion which civilized mankind, tames the fierceness of their passions and polishes the barbarity of their manner, inspires a man to discharge the offices of state with honour, inspires him with the love of his country and of mankind, and begets a detestation of tyranny and oppression of every kind. "If youth were early formed to such powerful and noble principles, glory should yet prevail in our land".⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Anniversary Sermon, 1748, Rev. R. Walker, p. 16, p. 40.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 1752, Rev. R. Bonar, p. 35

In 1754 the Society recorded its great satisfaction at the passing of two Acts by Parliament, the Jurisdiction Act and the Act Relating to the Forfeited Estates.⁶⁹ These two Acts gave great support to the Society's schemes for civilizing and improving the Highlands. It was laid down that the rents and profits of annexed estates were to be used in promoting the Protestant religion, good government, industry and manufactures, together with principles of duty and attachment to his Majesty King George, and the succession in his family.

Provision was made also for the division into more manageable units of some of the huge Highland parishes and for the erection within them of new churches and schools. New methods of agriculture and manufacture were to be encouraged, and the English language was to be taught. "These were the very methods", the Report points out "which had been advocated and followed by the Society for several years".

In dealing with the religious situation in the Highlands in 1754 the Report has this to say: "Men must have right principles to act from, or they will act from bad ones. This holds remarkably in the Highlands, where, if we are not careful to make the inhabitants good Protestants the Church of Rome will take care to make and keep them good Papists. If this Society is not careful to make them the one, the propaganda at Rome will

⁶⁹Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1754.
State of the Society in Scotland, p. 68-69

take care to make them the other. As long as there is either Pope or Pretender, so long will the inhabitants of the Highlands of Scotland be liable to become a prey to their cunning and artful insinuations".

In 1756, Mr. John Erskine, of Culross, deals with the theology of government,⁷⁰ and is at pains to show the theological absurdity of Jacobitism from this standpoint.

Uncontrolable, unlimited power, he claims, is the prerogative of God. This belongs only to the character of God. "None is qualified for it, but he who can never act amiss, being infinitely wise and just and good". He pours ridicule on the absurd and impious doctrine that the common Parent of mankind would never subject his creatures to the pride, ambition, frolic, caprice and arbitrary will, of an imperfect fellow mortal. Succinctly, he says: "Princes may be gods in the eyes of men, but they are but men in the eyes of God".

The Society's schools now number 170.⁷¹ The number of scholars has risen to 6,659; but the Irish language is still regarded with grave suspicion, and although the Society has printed books in Irish to counteract Popish publications produced in Rome, or by the Scotch College in France, it is still their

⁷⁰Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Anniversary Sermon, 1756, Rev. J. Erskine, p. 3-6, p. 26

⁷¹State of the Society, 1756, p. 40: Acts of Assembly, 1752. Index. A petition from the Presbytery of Kintyre for a fresh supply of Irish Bibles since people cannot read the Bible in English but would read it in Irish

opinion that "the Irish language ought to be expeditiously and intirely rooted out".

In 1760, Dr. Cumming, the Regius Professor of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History in the University of Edinburgh preached the Anniversary sermon. He deals with the impact made upon Highland life by the great numbers of Popish missionaries which Rome is sending into Scotland, propagating ignorance and superstition, perverting some and confirming others in their pernicious principles, "which are as dangerous to the State as to the reformed Religion". He exhorts all Protestants "who wish well to their religion and to a free government, to defeat their designs, and to rescue a brave people from the dark superstition and corrupt bondage of that corrupt Church".

A completely new factor, however, had recently entered into the Lowland Scots view of the Highlanders. During the North American campaign the Highland regiments had shown the most conspicuous gallantry. This new high regard for the Highlanders finds its place in Dr. Cumming's sermon. "They have become terrible to our enemies, who have felt and who will always fear the courage of so hardy a people". He hopes for the future that "they who have sometimes disturbed the peace of the country shall henceforth augment its strength, and prove its zealous defenders".

No such tribute as this was ever paid to the Highlands in any of the previous sermons. This must mark the end of that long period of distrust felt by Lowland Scotland of Highland life and ways. Nor is Dr. Cumming slow to point men to their dutiful

response to the bravery and courage of the Highland soldiers.

"All Scotsmen should be animated with a noble zeal to instruct the children, relations and friends of those who have bravely fought and died in the service of their king and country, and of those who crowned with victory, are ready to perform if called upon, as great exploits again".

A new motive had thus been given the Society to continue its work with redoubled effort in order to bring schooling, training in agriculture and industry and the Protestant Religion to Highland children, thus to prevent them from "falling a prey to that idolatrous Church, who never cease to do all that they can, to inspire these to whom they have access, with enmity to our holy religion, and with disaffection to our happy government".⁷²

By 1760 the ominous years of struggle in the Highlands against ignorance, popery, and disaffection are over, but the Highlands still present their problems. Ahead lies the patient work of consolidation that was to be carried out by ministers, catechists, schoolmasters and elders, to build the Presbyterian Kirk on the foundations that had been laid down so doggedly during these vital years.

In 1761, John Hyndman, who had conducted a special investigation into the situation in the Highlands and Islands for the General Assembly, sounds in his sermon a rousing note of

⁷² Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Anniversary Sermon, 1760, Rev. P. Cumming, D.D., p. 37, 81, 83.

optimism about the future of the Highlands. "I can see", he says, "under the blessings of heaven, the principles of Popery and superstition, of disloyalty and rebellion wholly destroyed; and, in place of them, I can see zeal for our holy Reformed Religion, for our sacred and civil rights, and a spirit of commerce and industry triumphing in the most remote, and in what were formerly deemed the most barbarous parts of our country".⁷³

ASSEMBLY SERMONS

We end this study of "The Decisive Years" with a glance at another group of Scottish sermons preached by leading Presbyterian Churchmen during this period. These sermons, preached on special occasions, contain statements of Church aims and policies which relate particularly to the menace of Jacobitism.

At the opening of the General Assembly in 1719 the sermon was preached by Rev. William Wisheart, Principal of the Edinburgh College, one of the leading ministers of the Church.⁷⁴ He faced an Assembly riven with internal disputes over the Abjuration Oath.⁷⁵ Against the taking of the Oath there was an estimated minority of

⁷³Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Anniversary Sermon, 1761, Rev. J. Hyndman, p. 34

⁷⁴A Sermon preached before his Grace John Earl of Rothes, His Majestys High Commissioner, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 14th May, 1719, by Rev. William Wisheart, p. 23.

⁷⁵Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. II, Abjuration Crisis. Letters LXXVI, CXXXII, CXLVII, CLI, CLXIV, p. 245-492.

a third, and Wisheart makes a strong appeal to the Assembly to live together and stay together in unity, taking as his text Psalm 133. He is anxious to make his brethren see in how many things they agree, and in how few they differ. "We agree", he says, "in the received principles of this Church, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, as being founded upon and agreeable to the word of God". Upon this firm foundation they must continue to stand. No differences between themselves over the Abjuration Oath must be allowed to overshadow this primary unity in things most surely believed. He, then, deals at some length with the specific problems which the Oath presents to some of the brethren, and lays down, in spite of these differences, their categorical agreement over the main issues with which the Oath was intended to deal.

"We are agreed in what relates to the civil government; particularly in asserting and declaring our loyalty to his Majesty King George as our only rightful and lawful Sovereign; in our disowning and disclaiming the Pretender, his having any right or title to the Crown, in renouncing and refusing any allegiance or obedience to him, and in our cheerful and zealous concern for the succession of the Crown in the Protestant line of his Majesty's royal family, against the Pretender, and all other persons whatsoever: And we are agreed in declaring our willingness to affirm all these points in our great Oath, if thereto required".

Wisheart's aim was to hold his brethren together in a strong and united Church. This had been Carstares' aim during the years

of Anne's reign. It was now more than ever necessary that the Church remain united, free of internal bickerings, ready for the tasks which would test it severely during the years of the new reign.

The preacher of the Assembly sermon in 1734 was Professor John Goudie of Edinburgh University, the retiring Moderator.⁷⁶ His sermon reflects some of the changes that have taken place since the early twenties. He thinks, for instance, that the spirit of persecution is now gone, and hopes that it will never return. He thinks the Church has far greater security than it has ever had before, "so that under God we are safe against all attempts of those that seek our ruin". His view of the future is that the Church may enjoy a "lasting tranquillity", "if we do not provoke Our God against us and destroy ourselves with our own hands". He thinks:- "We have now a fair opportunity put in our hand of suppressing Popery, our old and ruthless enemy". Goudie's sermon shows a Church that has grown strong and confident in its establishment under the House of Hanover, and more certain than for many years of the success of its policies in the Highlands and Islands.

Goudie represents an extremely optimistic, and to some degree an unrealistic, view of things. Perhaps, it is a viewpoint that one should expect to find emerging some twenty

76

A Sermon preached at the Opening of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland before his Majesty's Commissioner, by Rev. John Goudie, 2nd May, 1734, p. 7

years after the events of 1715; but it is in no way substantiated by the S.P.C.K. sermons of the same time, whose preachers were much more conversant with the true state of affairs in the North than Professor Goudie appears to have been.

Ten years later, in Aberdeen, a very different kind of sermon was preached by the Rev. John Bisset,⁷⁷ minister of the New Church. He was regarded by his contemporaries as being the strongest man in the Church of Scotland since the days of John Knox. He has some very hard things to say about the "Popish and Jacobite party in the North". In a sermon preached on the National Fast Day, 11th April, 1744, he says: "Jacobitism is the most common principle of the Protestant dissenters", and he cites the instances of those in Aberdeen in the Tolerated Meeting Houses who remain "in silent dissent" when the prayers for King George are offered. About those who are "connived at" by the law, who will not even join in the Tolerated worship, he says, words fail him to describe "their madness, folly and infatuation" in seeking the overthrow of a Protestant Government, and their desire to have a "Popish Pretender and Tool of France set upon the throne".

In great measure he blames the peaceful years through which the present generation has lived for their toleration and

⁷⁷ A Sermon Preached in the New Church of Aberdeen upon 11th April 1744, by Rev. John Bisset, p. 22-24 (Preface, p. 2); Extracts from John Bisset's Diary are to be found in Miscellany of the New Spalding Club, Vol. I, p. 347-395. See also, Allardyce, Scotland and Scotsmen of the Eighteenth Century, Vol. I, p. 304.

slackness with both Popish priests and Episcopal preachers. He accuses his brethren of having forgotten their own history, the "murders, bloodshed and massacres" committed by Papists, and by their friends "the prelatick party, when they have any power in the land". He fulminates against "two mass houses" within the city, "stated Popish meetings" and "idolatrous priests", who "swagger in the streets" in defiance of the laws. "No doubt", he says, "shortly expecting their Dunkirk friends, to rectify these laws, and to set all to the door".

In Edinburgh, on 23rd June, 1746, Alexander Webster, of the Tolbooth, preached the Victory sermon after the battle of Culloden.⁷⁸ He makes very explicit the real nature of the deliverance Culloden won for Scotland. It is no less from "the dangerous infection of pretended friends", "the emissaries of Rome and France," "the perfidious men who lurk in our own bosom", as from the injustice, oppression, rapine, plunder, bloodshed, murder, misery and destruction that would have followed the Rebellions "further progress". The success of the Rebellion would have meant - "Farewell, liberty of conscience", "the peaceful possession of the sanctuary", "the pure religion of Jesus", "the inestimable privileges of the late happy Revolution". "What could have been expected from Rome, but Romish tyranny? What from France, but French tyranny and oppression? What from an

⁷⁸ The Substance of Two Sermons preached in the Tolbooth Church, Edinburgh on the Occasion of the Thanksgiving, June 23rd, 1746 by Rev. Alexander Webster, p. 14-15, 23, 24.

Arbitrary Monarch, but chains and slavery? What from a resolved Papist, but the ruin of the Protestant interest? What from the bloody House of Stewarts, but fire and faggot, wrack and tortures?"

In contrast to Mr. Webster's fiery polemics, the sermon preached at the opening of the 1746 General Assembly by the Rev. Hugh Blair,⁷⁹ one of the ministers of the Canongate, presents a cool, dispassionate and penetrating account of the causes, aims and failure of the late Rebellion. "God beheld a nation, whom he had favoured with long tranquillity and peace, sunk by that tranquillity and peace into luxury and corruption of manners. He had blessed them with a happy Constitution, a mild Government and equal laws; but long enjoyment had deadened their sense of so valuable a blessing, and fed a giddy and factious spirit".

Blair sees the purpose of God at work in the events of 1745-46, and is concerned with their theological interpretation. God has an interest in this Nation still, he proclaims, and therefore, there is much need for the Nation "to acknowledge with thankfulness the hand of God in all these deliverances". "God sent forth the wrath of man to work a cure for all these evils - to shake that peace which had fostered luxury and impiety under its wings - to threaten that Religion and that Government to the"

⁷⁹A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, May 18th, 1746 before his Grace the Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly by Rev. Hugh Blair, p. 31-32

blessings of which we had been insensible - and to display before us these terrors of oppressive power and persecuting Religion, to the danger of which we had been laid asleep - He made us feel the value of all we should have lost".

"Our enemies boasted of the favour and countenance of heaven: countenanced they were by heaven, but not for their own sakes; and the success permitted them for a time, was meant for the improvement and benefit of those whom they intended to destroy".

In the middle of the 18th Century Scottish Presbyterians in the historic understanding of their Church did not separate the Reformation and the Revolution; the one was as essential as the other; the one was the completion of the other. An indication of this relationship between Reformation and Revolution is given in the Assembly's Act of 1749.⁸⁰ This Act recommended that ~~that~~ on Four Lord's Days each year sermons should be preached on the Principles of the Reformation and the Revolution. Such sermons should deal with - "The Principles of True Christianity; the Errors and Corruptions of Popery; the Grounds and Reasons of the Reformation; the Principles upon which the late Glorious Revolution and our present happy establishment are founded; the Security of our Liberties and Properties under a legal Government.

⁸⁰ Acts of Assembly, 1749. Act and Recommendation for Preaching on the Principles of the Reformation and Revolution, 19th May, 1749.

At the Synod of Perth and Stirling on 11th April, 1750, the Rev. Adam Fergusson,⁸¹ minister of Moulin, preached the sermon as laid down by the 1749 Act of Assembly.

He deals faithfully with the prescribed subjects for his sermon, namely, the conspiracies of the Church of Rome "to destroy Protestants or force them back to the obedience of the Roman See"; and Rome's "tyrannical usurped dominion" over the consciences of men, over the Church of Christ, and over the kings of the earth. He reminds the Synod of the recent designs, supported by the Church of Rome, to subvert their liberties and extirpate their religion. Nor does he let them forget that had these designs prevailed and taken effect; "We must again have exchanged religion for superstition", and "a well constituted Government for Tyranny and Arbitrary Rule". Such a disaster, however, he views against the background of Europe, and points out that if such a set-back had been suffered by Great Britain, more than the liberties of Scotland would have perished. "Together with us" would have perished "the liberties of Europe". The "treachery and violence" of the late French King to his Protestant subjects should be "an instructive lesson to all Protestants". So much so that he urges the whole Nation to remain "always upon their guard"; and, "never to trust their religion or civil liberties to one under the fatal influence of

⁸¹A Sermon upon Reformation and Revolution Principles preached before the Synod of Perth and Stirling, 11th April, 1750 by Rev. Adam Fergusson, p. 3-19, 24, 31, 19, 27.

like principles". "A Popish Sovereign", he warns his hearers, "can never be the guardian of Protestant subjects", since "he is obliged in point of conscience to persecute and destroy all who differ from him in religion". And, "although he gives promises and contracts", "ratified and confirmed even upon oath", "they avail nothing in this situation".

He argues: "There can be no security when made by one whose devotion to the See of Rome obliges him to hold all such engagements of no force or obligation, when they are prejudicial in any manner to (what is called) the Catholic Faith or its Interest". As the supreme example of this treachery he cites "the revoking of the Treaty of Nantz".

As for that "unhappy, bigoted, and restless set of men among ourselves, who are unwearied in their wishes and desires, and have made repeated attempts to have the British Throne once more filled with a Popish King" "All Thanks to God, they have not succeeded!"

He views them with "pity, mixed with just indignation", and describes the paradox they present. Many of them, he says, profess "a real dislike and aversion to Popery", and "a hope and belief" that if they succeeded in their aims the Protestant religion would be preserved, and the essential principles upon which the civil government of the land rested, remain unaltered. While, he admits, they may be sincere in their profession, it, nevertheless, shows a "credulity" and an "easiness of belief" that must be condemned. How little do they really know the "crafty, restless, ambitious, and tyrannical spirit of Popery".

Finally, he directs attention to the important Act of Settlement and its benefits. This is the barrier against all Jacobite and Popish tyranny, and secures for Britain "a race of Kings entirely Protestant", "who have hitherto been", and "we hope always will be".

We end this section with a glance at Rev. Alexander Webster's Assembly sermon of 1754.⁸² Previous sermons had roused men to a sense of the immediate dangers which threatened them, or had reminded them of their duty to stand firm for the principles established in Scotland by the Reformation and the Revolution. Alexander Webster deals with the immense benefits secured to the Nation by the British Constitution. It is "the just mean" between absolute monarchy, which is the "parent of tyranny and oppression", and the concept of "merely popular government", which he castigates as being "the source of anarchy and confusion". The present constitution, he claims, secures and regulates both the "prerogative of the crown" and "the rights of the people". But its chief and lasting benefit, from the point of view of the Church of Scotland, was that "it provides the best security for our religious as well as our civil liberty" through the Protestant succession of the Crown. There can be little doubt that Mr. Webster's sermon represents the views of

⁸²Zeal for the Civil and Religious Interests of Mankind recommended in a Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, May 23rd, 1754, at the Opening of the General Assembly, by Rev. Alexander Webster, p. 31

Presbyterian Churchmen of mid-18th Century Scotland on matters constitutional. The Constitution of Great Britain preserved by law those principles essential to the right relationship between Church and State in Scotland for which, they believe, they had contended since the Reformation.

Against such a bulwark it was now impossible for political or ecclesiastical Jacobitism to make any headway. Two armed Rebellions had failed to advance its aims. The Episcopalians retained the support of only a handful of Scotsmen, and suffered legal restrictions which made their future survival a matter of conjecture. Could they possibly survive if they continued in their Jacobitism? Would they survive even if they jettisoned this article of their Faith?

After 1760 the Established Church still had its own domestic problems to face in the Highlands and Islands, but they were capable of solution from within the resources of the Church itself. With the accession of George III it was reasonable to assume that the distractions and dangers of Jacobitism were over. Subsequent history proved this assumption to be correct.

CHAPTER 7

THE JACOBITE CHURCH

Between the Rebellions Scottish Episcopalianism was subjected to severe internal conflict and change. This period in its history sees the gradual defeat of the King's claim to supremacy over the Church. In its place there emerged a high doctrine of Diocesan Episcopacy, which was to have a decisive influence on the future life and theology of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Although Bishop Gadderar fought for his new theological insights with relentless doggedness the Church never lost its remnant Jacobitism. It still clung to its theology of Kingship. Perhaps it still had hopes of a political Restoration.

In opposition, however, to the Jacobite High Church Party there grew steadily an English Qualified Party, which rejected the Jacobitism of its fellow Episcopalianism, and turned more towards England for its Liturgical practice and its Episcopal Orders.

Ecclesiastical Jacobitism had by this stage not only divided Scotland between Presbytery and Episcopacy, it had divided Episcopalianism into two factions.

Aftermath of Rebellion

The Rise of Gadderar

The Defeat of Lockhart

Some Jolly Kist Letters

The Secret Clause of 1731

English Qualified Episcopacy

AFTERMATH OF REBELLION

The actions of the Episcopal party during the 1715 Rebellion had made it plain where their political and ecclesiastical loyalties lay. Whatever sympathy they had managed to gain previously with the Bishops of the Church of England, for their adherence to a doctrine and polity of the Church in accord with the tenets of Anglicanism, was now strained to breaking point by their declarations in favour of the Pretender, and their hopes for the restoration of Episcopacy in Scotland through the establishment of his Government.

Bishop Nicolson of Carlisle in two letters to Archbishop Wake gives a very critical view of the behaviour of his brother prelates in Scotland. The sons of Bishops Rose and Douglas were at the time prisoners at Carlisle.

Bishop Nicolson writes: "I am hourly pestered with addresses and solicitations from the friends and advocates of prisoners". "Among the rest the Bishop of Edinburgh warmly recommends to my counsel, direction and favour, a son of his, who is one of our guests. This youngster was taken in actual rebellion at the battle of Dunblane, and the father does not pretend to say that he repents of that sin; on the contrary, he gives broad hints of his being persuaded that his child now suffers for righteousness' sake".

"I have dealt very plainly with this mischievous prelate, who bemoans the complete desolation of the Scottish Church, and the insufferable hardship of her poor clergy. I have let him know, that I will no more bestir myself for his son than I would

for my own, in the like circumstances, but leave him entirely to God's mercy and the King's".¹

Both young men, he says, have been "trained up to a revolt against King George by their respective parents, as any moss troopers children were bred to stealing". And, he thinks that both have been brought to their present situation by parental example, "as if the two prelates had galloped before them into the battle".²

The failure of the Fifteen Rebellion in no way diminished the loyalty of the Bishop at Edinburgh towards the Prince he believed to be his rightful king. He engages himself in schemes to purchase five or six thousand bolls of meal to be sent to Sweden, "where there was a great scarcity", with a view to enlisting the support of the King of Sweden in the Pretender's cause.³

Again, after the failure of the Spanish landing in Ross-shire in March 1719, Lockhart makes it plain that the Bishop initiated the setting up of a Committee in Scotland "to overlook the King's affairs". The Bishop's view was that such a Committee would be able to give directions for time to time as might be necessary, and that by such an establishment a "unity" of measures would be

¹Ellis, Original Letters, Vol. III. Letter dated 13th September, 1716, p. 367

²Ibid., p. 396.

³Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 7. Letter from Duke of Mar to Captain Straiton; Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. II p. 347. Letter from James Trail of Montrose, October 18th, 1717, reads, "Our Jacobites are as big in their hopes as before the Rebellion, and they yet expect the King of Sweden".

maintained among the King's friends, "proper schemes might be concerted and pursued, and many things which did much harm be prevented".⁴

The Bishop apparently had made this proposal to the King the year before through the Earl of Mar, but with no result.⁵ Lockhart's son was, therefore, commissioned to "deliver any memorial or message" the Bishop would care to entrust to him when he is in Rome. The proposal is again made, this time with success, and a Committee, consisting of the Earls of Eglinton and Wigtown, Lord Balmerino, the Bishop of Edinburgh, Mr. Paterson of Prestonhall, and Captain Straiton was authorized by the King. To this Committee the King added later the names of Mr. Harry Maul, Sir John Erskine, Lord Dun, Powrie and Glengarry,⁶ and, later still, the name of Lockhart himself, whose name had been omitted previously by accident.⁷

However, before these letters from the King reached Lockhart the Bishop of Edinburgh died. The death of Bishop Rose marked the end of an era. He had kept control of the Church since the days of the Revolution, and had stood for that form of Episcopacy developed under the Stuart Kings in Scotland which had placed the appointment of Bishops within the prerogative of the Crown,

⁴Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 25

⁵Ibid., 26.

⁶Ibid., 30.

⁷Ibid., 31.

regarding the King's right in this respect to be a part of his absolute rule over his people, Church and State, by divine hereditary right.

There now began to grow in Scottish Episcopal circles the conception of an episcopate that owed nothing of its essential nature to the House of Stuart. It claimed its absolute right and succession from the primitive practice and tradition of the Church. Whatever the merit of its claim, it claimed too much, too completely, and too suddenly for its claims to be accepted in Scotland without severe and determined opposition. For the new ideas about the nature of Episcopacy and its relationship to the exiled King stood Bishop Gadderar of Aberdeen. As contender for the old established Episcopal ways of post and pre Revolution days stood Lockhart, the King's Agent.

It was Lockhart's aim to maintain the status quo, and to preserve the rights and prerogatives of the exiled King. It was Gadderar's aim, pursued with no less determination, to establish the Church on a sure and Scriptural basis, that preserved to it its own intrinsic nature and rights, and would in no way be compromised by the present claims of the Crown, or by any future claims in the event of a second Restoration.

THE RISE OF GADDERAR

Lockhart, well aware of the new situation which he now faced

on the death of Bishop Rose,⁸ ensured that the College of Bishops was quickly convened, and Bishop Fullarton duly elected Bishop of Edinburgh. To encourage Fullarton to take office Lockhart had "a hundred pounds sterling per annum settled upon him by a certain number of well disposed persons, to enable him to bear the charges of living at Edinburgh".⁹

Fullarton's election took place before the King's approbation had been obtained because of Lockhart's fears that the clergy might "split and divide". He writes; "It was thought sufficient that his Trustees here did approve it".¹⁰ He hastens to have Fullarton's name added to the number of Trustees, and the King in his letter to Fullarton says: "I am persuaded that my expressing herehow much I desire that the Scots clergy show you the same respect and deference that they did to the Bishop of Edinburgh will be sufficient to make them concurr with you in all matters which may tend to our mutual advantage".¹¹ Fullarton lost no time in sending the King a loyal address in the name of the College of Bishops. A reply

⁸Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh, No. 474 dated 14th May, 1720. Narrative of the Meeting of the Presbyters of Edinburgh after Bishop Rose's death.

⁹Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 35

¹⁰Ibid., p. 40. Letter from the King to Lockhart appoints Bishop Fullarton as a Trustee, dated 12th June, 1720.

¹¹Ibid., p. 38. Letter from the King to Fullarton, 12th June, 1720.

was received in the most fulsome terms:- "We received with particular pleasure the first assurances you gave us of your loyalty, and of your affection to our person and family. We have the deepest sense of the sufferings that the bishops and clergy of the Church of Scotland have undergone at all times for their firm adherence to our family, and will not fail to give them the strongest marks of our protection, gratitude and esteem, when it shall please God to put us in possession of our kingdoms".¹² By such protestations of loyalty and royal promises received it was hoped by Lockhart and the King's party that the surge of new and dangerous ideas about the relationship of the Bishops to the exiled King would be kept in check.

Lockhart was well aware of the source from which the new ideas spread into Scotland. In April, 1720, he wrote to the King: "We hear that Mr. Archibald Campbell (who, tho' adorned with none of those qualifications requisite in a bishop, and remarkable for some things inconsistent with the character of a gentleman, was most imprudently consecrated some years ago) is coming here from London, with a view of forming a party and propagating these doctrines which were at least unseasonably broached some years ago in England. As both clergy and laytie have a great regard for Bishop Fullarton and contempt of the other

¹²

Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, No. 475. Copy of the Royal Address from James R., July 2nd, 1720.

it is possible he will make few proselytes".¹³

This was wishful thinking on Lockhart's part. The new ideas which had come into Scotland through the influence of Campbell and Gadderar were much stronger than Lockhart imagined.¹⁴ In September, 1720, we find Bishop Fullarton writing to Campbell and Gadderar in London freely owning; "that the project of dividing the kingdom into districts, and having a bishop to be superintendent in every district, is a most desirable thing", and wishing that "the practice was as easy as the theory".¹⁵ The chief factor against the scheme coming into effect was simply that no bishop could be maintained on such a basis: the districts were hardly able to support the presbyters who served in them.

The first open opposition to the King's right to nominate to the Episcopate came in 1721 over the nomination of Bishop Freebairn.¹⁶ The case against Freebairn was that in the opinion of the clergy he was unsuitable for the office of bishop, and that the Bishops expected the King to consult with them before he proceeded to make a nomination, as he had appeared to promise in his reply to their loyal Address, dated July 2, 1720.

¹³ Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 35 Lockhart's Letter to the King, 25th April, 1720.

¹⁴ Skinner, Ecclesiastical History, Vol. II, p. 629

¹⁵ Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 41. Letter from Fullarton to Campbell.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 41.

The Bishops, therefore, pressed the King that no nomination be made without prior consultation with themselves, and supported their position by claiming that he was too far away to judge "character and circumstances". He would thus be prevented from making a bad choice, and this would be to the King's interests. This would also "endear him to the clergy", and, from a practical point of view, "were it known that he made no such promotions but by the advice and approbation of the bishops, people would apply to them before they proceeded to tease him with solicitations".¹⁷

No matter how favourably they sought to present their case, this was still an attack, perhaps even successfully disguised, against the absolute powers of the King to nominate.

The King compromised. There was little else he could do. In his reply, dated March 4th, 1721, he agreed that in these matters he would always "act in concert with the Bishops on the place", and hoped by this compromise that "all inconveniences would be avoided".¹⁸ It may have seemed to the King that he had compromised merely on points of procedure, but he was not left for long without being made aware of the real issues involved in his dispute with the Bishops. Freebairn's son, who had gone to Rome, informed the King that the real cause of the Bishop's unwillingness to consecrate his father "proceeded

¹⁷ Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 49.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 53

from an unwillingness in the Bishops to approve his taking upon him to name those that were to be bishops of the Church".

This suggestion, Lockhart says, "the King took very ill, seeming in no ways inclined to part with this right and privilege of the Crown"; and care was taken to let the Bishops and the Trustees know that he expected obedience.¹⁹

The Bishops and the Trustees, accordingly, hastily consulted each other; and Lockhart was instructed to write to the king advising him that under the present circumstances there was no need to consecrate any more bishops. To do so would be "prejudicial to your services and the interests of the Church, and probably would occasion much trouble and many difficulties".

Again, the real issue was to be shelved. Any possible impasse between Bishops and King was to be avoided. No new bishops need be consecrated therefore no new bishops would be consecrated. This formula, it was hoped, would gain time and save face.

Freebairn's consecration, however, had raised an opposition to the King's claims that would not be satisfied by such means.

Bishop Campbell was bitterly opposed to Freebairn's consecration, and wrote to his friends in Scotland against it. Lord Mar wrote to him in the King's name to win him over, but Campbell "stood his ground", and proceeded to write his objections

¹⁹Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 76

both to the King and the Earl.²⁰

Bishop Falconer had also expressed his scruples about Freebairn's consecration. He feared, he said, for "the rights of the Church", but he was told by Lockhart that "this was a very improper time to enter into such disputes".²¹ Lockhart assured him, in the King's name, that the King had no design to claim any other power than the laws of the land had expressly declared did belong to him, and had been exercised by his Royal progenitors. This advice, together with the repeated assurance that the King did not intend to nominate for consecration until he had the opinion and advice of the Bishops with regard to the qualifications and characters of the persons proposed, seems to have quieted Falconer's scruples. The Bishops, therefore, proceeded to the consecration of Freebairn and Cant, with renewed protestations of their loyalty to the King "as good and obedient subjects". Lockhart must have hoped once again that the threatened breach had been healed.

With the division over the right of the King to nominate went the division between Bishops and clergy over the Usages. The supporters of the Usages were also the party who were critical of the King's right. Opposed by Gadderar and Falconer on the question of the Usages Bishop Fullarton turned to the Trustees for

²⁰ Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh. Letter from Bishop Campbell to the Earl of Mar, No. 306.

²¹ Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 93

advice and help. Lockhart attends a full meeting of the College of Bishops to deal with this thorny problem. Unwilling to be drawn into the field of Patristic argument which dominated the minds of those in support of the Usages, Lockhart seeks to settle the dispute along more pragmatic lines. He urges unity and harmony in the King's name, and demands that they avoid anything that might give their enemies and the king's "a handle to 'culminate' them". He insists on a complete obedience being given to the College of Bishops, whose authority none of them dare "contradict", without at the same time "oppunging" the King's authority, since the College of Bishops derived their present power of governing the Church from the King.²²

While professing a great deal of loyalty and zeal for the King Gadderar and Falconer fell back on their basic theological argument and pleaded that what they sought to do was not the concern of the Crown, nor had it to do with the external government of the Church in any way. Lockhart met this argument by maintaining that such matters were very much the King's concern because of the consequences which might result, which might have an ill effect upon the King's interests. He forbade them to proceed any further in the matter of the Usages until the King's pleasure was known to them.²³

²²Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 95

²³Ibid., p. 96

Lockhart then advised the King to disapprove of the Usages in the hope that the laity would obey him, and in face of this royal opposition few would be persuaded to support Gadderar. Thus the whole project of introducing the Usages would come to nothing, and the Party which opposed the King on this issue would suffer another defeat.²⁴

Falconer yielded and submitted to the College of Bishops: but Gadderar was made of sterner stuff and defied them. He was, then cited to appear before the College to answer for presuming to introduce any innovations into the worship and ceremonies of the Church, and also to give an account of his title to exercise the jurisdiction of a Bishop in the Diocese of Aberdeen.²⁵

At this time Gadderar's only title to act as a "diocesan" Bishop was a mandate from Campbell, who regarded himself as canonically elected by the Presbyters of Aberdeen; thereby, of course, slighting the authority of the College of Bishops.²⁶

It was Lockhart's view that Gadderar's title was illegal. The fact that he had been willing to accept it revealed Gadderar's true character. He had put himself against "the King's friends", and harboured secret views and motives and designs "prejudicial to the King and the Church". If they could the King's Bishops within the College of Bishops would have suspended Gadderar, not only for his blatant disregard of their authority, but, also because he had become something of a public embarrassment. His "Usages" - mixture of the cup,

²⁴Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 97

²⁵Ibid., 101.

²⁶Ibid., 102.

chrism, prayers for the dead etc., were too akin to Popery for many people. The enemies of the Episcopalians were putting it about that even worse than this might be expected if their Popish King were ever to sit on the throne.²⁷

Lockhart was afraid next that Gadderar and his party might take it upon themselves to consecrate Bishops of their own school of thought without asking either the approval of the King or the other Bishops, "with a view to strengthening and increasing their parity".²⁸

A paper had been circulated privately which criticized the demand of the College of Bishops for obedience. The view was advanced that all the Bishops in Scotland were bishops "at large", "and owed no subjection to any other, or even to them all acting in a collegiate body, so that each was at liberty to exercise his spiritual jurisdiction where and after what manner he pleased, without being controulable or accountable to any other power". This, in Lockhart's view, was a highly dangerous doctrine. He writes post haste to the King to have "his

²⁷ Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 101 Also - Wodrow's Correspondence Vol. III, p. 70. Letter to Mrs. Wodrow, 10th May, 1723. Wodrow's letters reflect the contemporary view of the Presbyterians about Gadderar and his theology. "Some people of distinction in Edinburgh" thought that "he was in pay and contact with Papists abroad", and feared that after he had preached his "high flying Popish notions of the real presence, middle state etc." he would return and preach "some things yet nearer Popery, though these are pretty near it".

²⁸ Ibid., 104.

allowance and direction to consecrate at such times" as the Bishops shall "see cause and think it expedient, a certain number of other persons".

Four names were submitted to the King, Mr. Norrie of Dundee, Mr. Duncan of Kilbirnie, Mr. Rose of Couper and Mr. Gordon of Elgin, that he might "be pleased to authorize the consecration of all or such of them" as the Bishops should think convenient, "and at such times as they judged proper".²⁹

Lockhart hoped for a speedy reply to this request for there was a chance that the Bishops would discipline Gadderar and appoint a Bishop to the Diocese of Aberdeen in his stead. If this were to take place Lockhart knew he must have someone ready to take Gadderar's place. He suggests, therefore, that the King's Trustees should be allowed to give immediate approval to any consecration that might become necessary, and that thereafter letters of approval might be obtained from the King.³⁰

This the Trustees agreed to do. Lockhart, even in this emergency, was not unaware of the dangerous precedent which might be established by his actions to the detriment of the King's authority. He, therefore, had the Bishops write to him disclaiming any design of encroachment upon the royal prerogative, and stating the reasons for their haste in Mr. Norrie's consecration.

²⁹Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 105.

³⁰Ibid., p. 106

The Trustees, also wrote to the King assuring him that they were very far from having any designs to lessen his royal authority. They asked that he be graciously pleased to approve Mr. Norrie's consecration, and professed their dutiful regard towards him, "which was suitable to the principles and doctrine of the loyal orthodox Church of Scotland, which they had hitherto maintained in the worst of times".³¹

Meantime, however, Gadderar made some show of submission to the Bishops, and the College resolved to delay after all the consecration of Mr. Norrie until they knew the King's pleasure; and asked Lockhart to submit to the King, in place of Mr. Gordon's name, the name of Mr. Ochterlonie of Aberlemno.³²

The King wrote a reply to Lockhart's letters in November 1723, but delays giving him an answer to his requests.³³ Whether this was to make Lockhart and the Trustees aware of his rights, and his unwillingness to be treated by them in this way, we do not know, but next year, in March, he writes his approval

³¹Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 106. Letter dated 24th August, 1723.

³²Ibid., p. 111

³³Ibid., p. 114. King's Letter to Lockhart, 24th November, 1723.

of the four nominations submitted to him.³⁴

THE DEFEAT OF LOCKHART

T. Stephen, the Episcopalian historian, writing about these events has little to say in favour of either the King's Bishops - or College Bishops as they were called - or the King's Agent, Lockhart.³⁵

Dealing with the twin questions of "College Bishops" and the rights of the King over their nomination, he quotes approvingly from "Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated":-

"However proper and respectful to the unfortunate House of Stuart it might have appeared in the eyes of a few individuals, it was far from being acceptable to the clergy in general, or giving any satisfaction to the general body of the laity, who adhered to the communion of the Scottish Episcopal Church. They longed for the revival of diocesan episcopacy, as that form of Church government to which they had always been accustomed, and which they knew to be most conformable to the primitive model. They saw no necessity for confounding the things of God with the things of Caesar, and considered that the Church being now destitute of all secular support or encouragement from the

³⁴Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 116. King's Letter to the Bishops, 18th March, 1724; Episcopal Chest MSS provide most valuable material on the issues of the day. See Viscount Arbuthnott's Correspondence with Bishop Campbell between July 8th, 1723 and March 1st, 1725. Nos 52-61. His letters deal with such subjects as - "Number of clergy in favour of restoring Usages"; "Gadderar's Concessions for the sake of Unity"; "the Politics of the day, with reference to the Duke of Argyle and the Earl of Ilay"; and "Party strife among the Episcopalians"; MS. No. 121 deals with, "Queries and Answers about the bishops after the Revolution"; MS No. 122 deals with "Notes of Canons and Rules by the Scottish Bishops after the death of Bishop Rose".

³⁵Stephen, T., History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 160-162.

State had full liberty to betake itself to its own intrinsic powers, and make whatever provision was necessary for the succession of its sacred orders".³⁶

Stephen argues that there could be no occasion for asking a licence from the Crown for the election of Bishops, who were not to be distinguished by any mark of the royal favour, nor to enjoy any peculiar benefit for the support of their profession.

There is no doubt that historians of the Stephen school wish their view of the doctrinal and political struggle taking place within Scottish Episcopalianism at this time to be accepted. It must be asked, however - Is it accurate history? Is it not rather a case of attempting to read back into the historical events a doctrine of the Church that came to be accepted much later? If what is claimed in "Primitive Truth" be correct, then why did the views of Gadderar meet with such vigorous and determined opposition?

Is it not far nearer the truth to claim that Lockhart and his "King's" or "College Bishops" did in fact represent the view of Episcopacy which had prevailed in Scotland since before the Revolution? It was Lockhart's party which struggled to maintain the views of the Bishops and laity of the pre-Revolution Church. What Gadderar and his friends contended for was something so radical and new in the experience and thought of the Scottish Episcopalians that it represented an apparently disastrous deviation from the previously held traditional

³⁶ Skinner, John, Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated, p. 390-394.

concepts of the relationship between Bishop and Crown. What Gadderar stood for was a revolution in the Episcopal ideology of his day. No less radical in its impact than the new theology of the Reformers had been upon the Church life and thought of Scotland in the 16th Century, and, similarly, going back for its authority to the Scriptures, and the example and practice of the primitive, apostolic Church.³⁷

Stephen, indeed, has so immersed himself in the ecclesiastical struggle of the time that he writes with all the fire, vindictiveness and enthusiasm of an actual participant. "It is painful", he writes, "to observe the vile, abject, secular spirit which the long predominant principles of erastianism had fostered, both in the trustees and in the prelates. The bishops actually hugged the chains with erastian affection that the Revolution had knocked off their manacled limbs; thus putting their trust in princes, and betraying the rights of the Church, which they were now in a position to assert. If the Church had placed her full trust and affiance in Christ, Who is the Head of the Body, she needed not have feared what the King even in possession could have done, far less the unfortunate exile

³⁷ Episcopal Chest MSS provide material on this period, as follows MS No. 124 "Bishop Campbell's Proposal to set up an Episcopal College with an Elected Primus", No. 125 "Formula against Usages by Bishop of Edinburgh", 11th February, 1723, No. 126 "Remonstrance by College of Bishops against Usages", 12th February, 1723, No. 127, "College of Bishops Letter to Clergy and Laity against Usages", 1723, No. 128, "Letter of College Bishops to Bishop Gadderar", 29th March, 1723, No. 129 "Proposals concerning Accommodation among Bishops over Usages", 1724, No. 130 "Accommodation Articles", 1724.

who was without even the shadow of real power".³⁸

This is a harsh judgment. To some degree it is a prejudiced and warped judgment. It was surely more than "the fallacious hope of a restoration" or "their being appointed to the ancient legal bishopricks after the wished for restoration" had taken place which lies behind the actions of the King's bishops. It is suggested that they acted as they did chiefly because they still believed that God had a hand in ordering both Kings and Bishops. In their view He used the Divine order of Monarchy to seal the Divine appointing of Bishops. They might have been in error in this view, but it was an error which their predecessors in Scotland had all shared, and they were still prepared to hold firmly to it.

The great contribution which Gadderar made in this situation was that he provided the Scottish Episcopalians with a theological concept of the Church and its Divine ordering which enabled them to break their old theological chains. Gadderar fought not for a restoration of the old ways, but for the introduction of a new concept and pattern of diocesan episcopacy within which both presbyters and laity were to play a full and new role.

Evidence for this view is found, too, in Presbyterian sources. In December, 1723, Wodrow wrote to Mr. George Chalmers, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, returning a paper of Gadderars which had been sent to him. He makes this comment:- "He (Gadderar)

³⁸ Stephen, T., History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 175

appears pretty just in his reasonings from the principles he goes on, and I dont see how the Bishop of Edinburgh, as sometimes he calls him, will easily evite them, unless he a little more openly declares the ancient usages to be modern Popery, and come off a Diocesan Prelate's being the centre and principle of unity, and freely own the old Scots Prelacy, which I know was once his opinion, in opposition to the English (Non Juring) usages and ceremonial".³⁹

Between the years 1724 and 1726, when he was obliged to leave Scotland, Lockhart did his utmost to prevent the rise to power of Gadderar's party. He was most anxious that on Fullarton's death, "which as he is of a great age and not very healthy, may happen to soon", Irvine should be previously nominated by the King to succeed him immediately. He advises the King accordingly. To this letter he adds a postscript to the effect that Rattray of Craighall is being proposed by the gentlemen of Angus to be consecrated as their Bishop. Rattray was the most outstanding Patristic scholar that the Scottish Episcopalians possessed at this time, but he was a supporter of Gadderar, and, therefore, we can understand why the College Bishops and the King's Agent advised against his nomination.⁴⁰

At the beginning of the winter of 1724 the College of Bishops met. At this meeting Lockhart put plainly the crucial question.

³⁹Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. III, p. 96. Letter to Mr. George Chalmers, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, 10th May, 1723.

⁴⁰Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 118. Lockhart's letter to the King, August 18th, 1724.

In whom did they think the power of electing a Bishop was lodged?

Lord Panmure advanced the view that by the legal establishment of the Church of Scotland, the right belonged to the Dean and Chapter, but as that could not in the present situation of affairs be obtained, the next best method to be followed was that of the primitive Church, when no bishop could be appointed to any diocese without the concurrence of the majority of the clergy and the approbation of the people. In this view he was supported by Gadderar, Falconer and Rattray.

Lockhart's answer to the case put forward by Panmure and his friends was that the Dean and Chapter elected the King's nomination, which he made by a *congé dévire* sent to the Chapter, who were obliged to elect the very person the King named. He argued, therefore, that the power of appointing Bishops to Dioceses was properly vested in the King.

In addition he had some disparaging criticisms to make about popular elections to offices in the Church, instancing the trouble caused by the popular calls of Presbyterian ministers. He ended his speech by asserting that the King should use his power, "since it was plain to what a bad use some were like to turn the liberty he left them".⁴¹

Gadderar's party was now strong enough not only to present

⁴¹Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 122

their case effectively but, also, to refuse to agree with the decisions of the other Bishops and actively oppose them. We find that Gadderar and Fullarton, therefore, oppose Norrie's consecration, with considerable lay support. Lockhart, writing back to the King about this state of affairs, says: "The Bishops are broken in pieces amongst themselves, but the divisions and heats among the laity is also very great and has occasioned such a breach and misunderstanding as will not, I fear, be easily or soon accommodated".⁴² He advises the King, in order to prevent such disputes breaking out again, that he should write to the Bishop of Edinburgh to ensure that the College of Bishops does not settle any bishop "to the charge and inspection of any particular diocese or province", until they have informed the Trustees, who would make enquiries about the acceptability and fitness of the particular nominee for the proposed district.⁴³

It was Lockhart's hope that this method would prevent the discords and divisions which had broken out: that at the same time it would "support and maintain the power lodged in and practised by the Crown in the nomination and appointment of Bishops"; and would in addition "be mightily agreeable to your subjects, when they see your care and concern for them".⁴⁴

The King's letter to the Bishop of Edinburgh, dated March 21,

⁴²Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 125

⁴³Ibid., p. 129

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 129. Lockhart's letter to the King, 8th December, 1724.

1725, shows that he had accepted Lockhart's advice, and gives instructions that "no diocese or province" is to be allotted to any new Bishop without the King's Trustees being acquainted with their plans.⁴⁵ These instructions were conveyed to the Bishops in very precise terms in the King's letter dated July 20, 1726.⁴⁶

By 1726, however, Lockhart is surrounded by very old and infirm men, who "must drop fast off". Bishop Fullarton has lost his memory and is nearing the end of his days. Bishop Irvine who might have succeeded him is dead. In his letters to Lord Inverness, the King's Secretary, he suggests Bishop Duncan to replace Bishop Fullarton, and Mr. Gillan as Bishop Irvine's successor. He assures the Secretary that Gillan's nomination would be approved by all who wished well to Church and State "as he is a person of excellent sense and learning, and withal has zeal and firmness to go through with what he thinks good for the good of the cause, and his authority will go far towards keeping the rest in bounds".⁴⁷

In spite of Lockhart's hopes for Gillan old age made such inroads among the King's friends that few were left to be made Bishops. New men of the "Diocesan-Usager" Party began to be nominated.⁴⁸

⁴⁵Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 152. King's letter to Bishop of Edinburgh, 21st March, 1725.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 311. King's letter to Bishops, 20th July, 1726

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 270. Lockhart's letter to Lord Inverness, April, 30th 1726

⁴⁸Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, No. 477(a). Letters - 1. Bishop Cant to Bishop Miller Apologizing for taking part in the Consecration of Ochterlonie and Rose, November 30th, 1726. 2. Bishop Duncan to Bishop Gadderar, giving his defence of the Consecrations by the College, December 1726. 3. Bishop Gadderar's reply to Bishop Duncan condemning the Consecrations by the College, January 7th, 1727.

Rattray of Craighall was put forward in opposition to Gillan; and from contemporary letters we gain an insight into the mind and feelings of the opposition.

Robert Keith and Arthur Miller both wrote letters to their friends against Gillan's consecration. Miller points out that although Gillan claimed that he was recommended for office by the Bishops "yet we cannot find one of the Order to own it, but the contrary", and adds, "I cannot go along by implicit faith in so dark an affair".

Robert Keith makes it plain in his letter that Carnwath had called the meeting of Bishops "in order to consider of the admitting into their order Mr. John Gillan upon a mandate procured by that gentleman from beyond sea".⁴⁹

He says that a good number of the clergy were "much shocked at this lay recommendation" or rather mandate. He points out that the words used were "authorize you", and fears that as well as this insult to the intrinsic rights of the Church there was also afoot a plot to have Gillan succeed the present Bishop of Edinburgh (Fullarton) at his death, and of being coadjutor during the remainder of his life. "All these things", says Keith, "have made them resolve (the Edinburgh presbyters) to oppose the

⁴⁹ Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh, No. 824. Bishop Robert Keith's letter, 28th September, 1726.

consecration all they can by remonstrating against it to the Bishops".⁵⁰

Next year, in two letters to Rattray, Keith again returns to these matters, and makes plain Lockhart's position regarding the Remonstrators. He feared that after Fullarton's death they would elect a successor without consulting the King (the name has been left blank in the letter and James 8 added by a later hand), and had apparently put it to Keith that his party had "a mind to exclude (the King) from his privileges".⁵¹

In this struggle between the Diocesan Usager Party and Lockhart 1727 should be regarded as being the decisive year. Lockhart's party was no longer able to hold its ground against the rising strength of Gadderar and his friends.

⁵⁰Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh, No. 477. Petition of Eighteen Presbyters of Edinburgh to the Bishops not to Consecrate to Episcopate by Lay Influence, October, 1726; "We ought not to doubt of your truly Catholick principles and we assure ourselves that you consider the resolute asserting of the intrinsick powers of the Church as an essential part of the depositum committed to you, and that you have a thorough conviction of the fatal mischief which the Christian Church hath suffered by a secular invasion upon the spiritual power since the Reformation both beyond seas and in this island. It hath pleased Almighty God by withdrawing from this afflicted Church the protection of the secular arm to afford our ecclesiastical rulers a happy opportunity of vindicating and rescuing this spiritual power from all lay encroachments".

⁵¹Ibid., No. 829. Bishop Keith's letter to Dr. Rattray of Craighall, 14th January, 1727, also, No. 827. Letter to Dr. Rattray, 18th May, 1727.

It is true that Lockhart himself had to leave Scotland at this time for his own safety. His correspondence with the exiled King had been interrupted by the Government. Yet even if he had remained in Scotland it is extremely doubtful whether he would have been able to manage for much longer in the King's interests the Party now in active opposition against him.

SOME JOLLY KIST LETTERS

The ideas which began in the diocese of Aberdeen, through the influence of Gadderar had spread throughout the whole Church. They are discussed at great length in much of Bishop Alexander's Correspondence. To a selection of these Letters, therefore we now turn.

Dr. William Garloch was a doctor in Edinburgh and a constant correspondent of Mr. Alexander, minister at Alva (later Bishop Alexander).

He writes to Mr. Alexander early in 1727, saying that such are the "animosities" between the two contending parties that he fears "they may bring it to the length of a schism before one party yield to the other".

"Mr. Miller," he continues "was here last week and met with his electors, but none of the other party attended the meeting. They say (and I think there's something in it) that the meeting being held without any authority there could be no lawful election, and till he be confirmed by the College of Bishops will not acknowledge his title. He again says that tis the inherent right of priests to elect their bishop, and that he has nothing to do with the College, and his friends are hopeful that a College

will never be called, for they make themselves sure of Gadderar as the new Primus".⁵²

Robert Keith was very much involved in the events taking place in Edinburgh at this time. He says that the motion to proceed to make a Remonstrance to the Bishops was carried by 22 to 10 votes. The defeated party then left the meeting, and the Remonstrance was drawn up.

Again, the main issue in the Remonstrance is made plain "We entered next", he says, "into a resolve that tis the inherent right of presbyters to elect their bishops, and that from among bishops or presbyters, and afterwards we unanimously elected Bishop Miller. That is the single truth. Last week our Bishop called us all together (but none of the Dissenters obeyed) and accepted his office by virtue of our election only". "The East side of Tay you'll hear have elected Dr. Rattray. Tell me what your judgement is of your "District", whether they will elect or receive a Bishop from the College?"

"A copy of our Minutes was sent North immediately, and I am assured we shall be applauded by all that country. We have more yet to say in due time".⁵³

52

Jolly Kist, MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 55. Letter from W. Garloch, Edinburgh to J. Alexander, Alva, 19.5.1727; Also - Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, No. 13. Letter from Dr. George Garden and Others congratulating Bishop Miller on his election to the Episcopate by his own Presbyters, 22nd July, 1727. Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh, No. 14. Letter from Presbyters of Aberdeen to Presbyters of Edinburgh on death of Bishop Fullarton, 26th July, 1727.

53

Jolly Kist, MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 56. Letter from Mr. Robert Keith, Edinburgh to J. Alexander, Alva, 19.5.1727.

Lockhart and Bishop Duncan were angrily and violently opposed to this Remonstrance, and did all in their power to prevent its acceptance by the Bishops.

Lockhart regarded it as being "full of treason, falsehoods and ill manners". It began, he said, by representing the encroachments made on the powers and rights of the Church since the Reformation. It earnestly exhorted and required the College to lay hold on the opportunity they now had to regain what was lost, when the Crown was not in a position to maintain its privileges. These sentiments he regarded as a "fine specimen of these gentlemen's loyalty and generosity to the King".⁵⁴ It showed clearly their view of what had taken place at the Revolution, which was the failure of the Church to rid itself of domination by the Crown and stand by its own intrinsic rights.

Bishop Duncan told the Remonstrating Presbyters that he would throw their Remonstrance in the fire if they presented it to the College. He said he thought they were acting in a most seditious and unwarrantable manner against their civil and ecclesiastical superiors. Since Mr. Gillan was to be consecrated a "Bishop at large" and not of any particular diocese it was no concern of theirs. Finally, he told them that by their conduct they were "destroying all order and government in the Church", and that their actions were "directly inconsistent with that loyalty which had hitherto been the glory of the Scots Church".⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 325

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 326

Fullarton's death occurred in May, 1727. At his demise Gadderar's Party felt themselves strong enough to proceed to the consecration of Mr. Dunbar and Mr. Keith as Bishops in order to give their party a numerical advantage over the King's Bishops. By this action they showed complete disregard for the rights of the Crown, and a complete contempt for the authority of the College of Bishops. This was an open act of revolt by "factious Bishops", "who did not think themselves bound to ask after the King's approbation". "The independence of the Church", Lockhart says, "was in all their mouths, and indeed they showed no regard for any powers civil or ecclesiastic" but only "in so far as they were on their side of the question".⁵⁶

The King's Bishops immediately proceeded to consecrate Gillan and Ranken to restore numerical parity. Ranken's consecration did not have the King's approval, only that of two of his Trustees, Mr. Graham and Mr. Hay.⁵⁷ Since one of the main criticisms against the action of the "factious bishops" was that they had proceeded without the King's approval, Lockhart makes it clear that he, at least, viewed this step as being detrimental to the true interests of both the King and the Church.⁵⁸

Gadderar's Diocesan Party is now the stronger of the two. It contains men of more learning and greater ability than the King's Party. Its Bishops have behind them the support of the

⁵⁶ Lockhart Papers, Vol. II, p. 333

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 334

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 335

people and clergy in their own Districts. Their next step against the King's Party was to propose Six Canons to be the rule of the Church, in order to establish those principles for which they had contended.⁵⁹

If these Canons were to be generally accepted then the position of Diocesan Episcopacy would be firmly established, and the rights and powers of the Crown would have virtually come to an end.

The first Canon stated that there could be no order or unity in the Church without a metropolitan and, therefore, conferred metropolitan powers upon the Bishop of Edinburgh during the vacancy of the See of St. Andrews.

The second Canon stated that no Bishop was to have a vote in the Councils or Assemblies of Bishops "but such Bishops only as have a part of this flock committed to them by an election from the Presbyters thereof, confirmed by the metropolitan with consent of the local comprovincial Bishops".

The third Canon said: "Seeing the consecrating of Bishops at large is contrary to the canons and practice of this Church, and not to be executed but from an urgent necessity in some

⁵⁹Stephen, T, History of Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 251. Six Canons drawn up at Edinburgh, 22nd June, 1727. Episcopal Chest MSS. The following MSS refer to this Agreement No. 133 Terms laid down by the Bishop of Edinburgh and Other Bishops for the Peace of the Church, 23rd June, 1727. No. 135. Bishop Duncan's Letter to Bishop Miller asking him to call a Meeting, June 14th, 1727, No. 137, Paper by Bishop Duncan to Bishop Ochterlonie about accommodating all Differences, No. 138 Proposals of Accommodation and Scheme of Districts, 1727, No. 136 Letter from College Bishops to Bishop Miller offering terms of Peace but declaring his election Null, June 24th, 1727.

particular and rarely occurring circumstance: that henceforth none be consecrated into that order but such as shall be regularly elected to a particular diocese or district by a majority of the presbyters of that diocese or district; and these consecrations to be performed by the metropolitan or his order, with the consent of the local Bishops of the province, unless such urgent necessity should happen (which God forbid), of which necessity the metropolitan or local Bishops are to be judges".

Deans were to be appointed in each Diocese (Canon 4). No Bishop was to function in another Bishop's diocese without the consent of the Bishop of that diocese (Canon 5). And, most important of all, no one elected to a diocese or district was to be consecrated before he had subscribed these Canons (Canon 6). The reply of the College Bishops to this overture was immediate. They suspended Bishop Miller and appointed Bishop Freebairn to the superintendence of Edinburgh.

By 1731, however, they were able to resist the pressure of the Diocesan Party no longer, and in December of that year they accepted a Concordat, which contained the principles upheld by the Canons; and the principle of Diocesan Episcopacy based upon the intrinsic rights of the Church came to be the polity and doctrine of the Church.

The Articles of Agreement⁶⁰ stated that:- No Bishop should be consecrated without the consent of the majority of the Bishops

⁶⁰Episcopal Chest MSS, No. 131. Articles of Union by Bishops, 1731.

(2) Presbyters should not elect a Bishop without a mandate from the Primus, (3). Bishops should choose the Primus (4). The Bishops intimated that they had chosen Bishop Freebairn as Primus (5). Dioceses were allocated as follows (6) - Glasgow to Duncan, Dunblane to Gillan, Fife to Rose, Dunkeld to Rattray, Brechin to Ochterlonie, Aberdeen to Gadderar, Moray and Ross to Dunbar, Edinburgh to Lumsden, and Caithness Orkney and the Isles to Keith.

The Bishops, however, were careful to add - "by the foresaid division of districts we do not pretend to claim any legal title to the dioceses".⁶¹

This clause could be interpreted as being a protection from any action that might be taken by the Government. To claim a legal title would have been to place themselves on the wrong side of the law. On the other hand this clause may be regarded as a concession to the Jacobitism of former days. They were prepared to wait for the restoration of the House of Stuart, when the legal title to the dioceses would be restored to them by a Royal authority once again properly constituted.

THE SECRET CLAUSE OF 1731

There was, however, a secret clause to the Agreement of 1731, which for obvious reasons was never made public. The right of nomination to the Sees of Edinburgh and Glasgow was retained by the

⁶¹ Keith, Scottish Bishops, p. 527

exiled King.⁶²

It may be that from Gadderar's point of view this was a concession that he could well afford to make. At the time its practical implications might be thought to be of little consequence. Yet, in years to come, this secret clause was to play a major role in the struggle between the Presbyters of Edinburgh and the Bishops for what they believed to be the rights of their Order in the proper and effective understanding of Diocesan Episcopacy.

That a small group still supported the King's claims is apparent from the conduct of Mr. Robert Freebairn, son of the Bishop of Edinburgh, at the drawing up of the Agreement and Articles in 1731. Dr. Rattray's Memorial⁶³ of these events makes it plain that he considered himself to be there as a representative of the King: "to signify the mind the pleasure of another Person to whom he promised to communicate these Articles". He assured the Bishops, also "in the name of that Person that none should be named to their Order but upon their own recommendation".

It is doubtful, in view of the content of the Articles, whether the Bishops took the pretensions of Robert Freebairn very seriously. Nevertheless, there was a fear in the minds of many

⁶² Farquhar, G.T.S., Three Bishops of Dunkeld, p. 88-90 gives a very full treatment of Bishop Alexander's interpretation of the secret clause in the 1731 Concordat.

⁶³ Episcopal Chest, MSS, Edinburgh, No. 139. Memorial in Bishop Rattray's hand covering the years 1731-1740.

of the clergy that James would make every effort through men of Freebairn's party to exercise his ancient right of nomination to the Episcopate.

In 1733, Robert Freebairn returned to Scotland from across the sea, and a report was quickly spread abroad that he had brought with him two or three nominations from King James. This affair, Rattray tells us, came to be the subject of common conversation, "to the manifest risque of the poor remains of this Church". It further became clear that Freebairn had misrepresented himself at Court and had procured the nominations as if he had obtained a commission from the Bishops to do so; in spite of having been warned by the Bishops before he went, "not to embroil their affairs by attempting anything of that kind".⁶⁴

At the beginning of 1735 Bishop Gillan died. As his successor Bishops Rattray, Dunbar and Keith proposed Mr. Robert White. This was opposed by Bishops Ochterlonie and Freebairn since he did not have in his favour "a certain nomination" (from King James). The Diocesan Bishops proceeded none the less to Mr. White's consecration, and, Rattray says: "That District (and some of them are of as untainted principles as any in the Kingdom) did heartily receive him, notwithstanding the unwearied pains taken by Freebairn, Ochterlonie and Robert

⁶⁴Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 131. Letter from R. Lyon to J. Alexander, 30.10.1733. Lyon asks Alexander if he had heard if any conge de lires had come to Scotland recently, and for whom?

Freebairn" to the contrary.⁶⁵

Robert Lyon's letters from Crail reflect the attitude of many of the clergy against the attempt of the small College party to exercise influence in Church affairs. He writes to Mr. Alexander in February, 1735, asking for information about "What way the clergy of the late Bishop Gillan are pointing for a successor to him?". He hears, he says, that some of the old College "are yet fermenting and striving to leaven the whole lump", which he had hoped had been "intirely purged out". He appears most anxious that Rattray or Keith be chosen as their Ordinary, or, at least, someone those Bishops would approve of. "But what", he says, "if you and I think differently about this? If you approve of Conges, even in our present state, we will differ; for then you will think they should have a new man who is already conged, tho' not consecrated, and I will think otherwise": but if they differ - and here he gives us some indication of the division that existed between those who still held to the rights of the King in these matters and those who did not - he hopes it will be "without jeering or jostling one another in every company, as is the (not very) laudable custom at Edinburgh".⁶⁶

⁶⁵Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, No. 139. Bishop Rattray's Memorial.

⁶⁶Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 144. Letter R. Lyon to J. Alexander, 18.2.35

Mr. Alexander was, of course, a strong supporter of the "Diocesan-Usager" party, and among the Jolly Kist Letters there is a Manuscript written in his own hand giving his views on the divisions and disputes which split the Church at this time:-

In matters which are not vital he holds that Christians must bear with one another, and must not divide and separate, but agree to differ among themselves in faith and love and Christian fellowship. In weightier matters, however, he holds that the rules of peace are secondary. What are weightier matters? His list of Fundamental Principles include, the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ, the Freedom and Accountableness of Man, the Resurrection of the dead and a future judgement, future rewards and punishments, and the Necessity of Divine Grace, "which infers the necessity of means, the Ministers of Gods appointment, and with authority and commission from Him for dispensing them, and this implies the Divine institution of the Church as a Society, with proper officers and as God's vice regents in spiritual matters, and accountable to Him alone".⁶⁷

There is little doubt that Alexander held, as his last sentence implies, a high doctrine of the Church. This same note is again stressed in Bishop Dunbar's instruction given to Robert Lyon to act as his proxy at the Meeting of the Bishops

⁶⁷Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, no. 194. MS in John Alexander's hand on Rules for keeping or breaking peace in Church affairs.

in Edinburgh in July 1738. He regards it as highly expedient that the Bishops discuss only what he calls purely ecclesiastical matters. That is - "Such only as concern the pure intrinsick rights of the Church as derived from Christ and His apostles, and practised upon in the first ages before she came under legal establishment".⁶⁸

Yet with this high doctrine of the Church there went also a hope for the legal restoration of their Church. In 1738 the Synod declared - "That the Bishops do not arrogate to themselves any temporal right whatsoever in case it shall please God, in the course of His Providence, at any time hereafter to restore the Church to a legal establishment. Nor do they thereby in the least intend to incroach upon the just rights and privileges, competent to secular Powers, in ecclesiastical affairs".⁶⁹

Such a Restoration to a legal establishment would not involve however the Narrative makes clear by its carefully qualified terms, the return of an establishment which gave the Crown the absolute rights and prerogatives it had enjoyed over the Church at the time of the Revolution. The Bishops obviously hoped for

⁶⁸Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, No. 150. An Instruction to Rev. Robert Lyon to act as Bishop Dunbars proxy at the Meeting of Bishops, Edinburgh, July 7th, 1738 - Bishop Dunbar regards it as highly expedient that the Bishops discuss only purely ecclesiastical matters, that is, "Such only as concern the pure intrinsick rights of the Church as derived from Christ and His Apostles and practised upon in the first ages before she came under legal establishment".

⁶⁹Ibid., No. 152. Synod Narrative, 1738

a Restoration, which, if it took place, would give full countenance to the principles laid down in the Canons and Concordat.

By 1738, we may safely say that the only form of Restoration possible for the Church was one in which the Crown was pleased to accept a relationship to the Church which did not in any way infringe the conception of Diocesan Episcopacy which had emerged and triumphed since 1722. Although this major change in theological thought had taken place among Scottish Episcopalians no such change had taken place in King James's basic understanding of the nature of his Kingship. Whatever he had been compelled to accept in practice, in theory, at least, he still held to the Stuart concept of absolute and divinely ordered Monarchy.

If there had been a Restoration at this stage it is more than likely that the Church would have sustained a very severe jolt. Episcopalians might have found themselves in a position in which if they had accepted establishment again it would have been at too great a spiritual cost.

Bishop Gadderar, that man of "stern and fearless integrity",⁷⁰ died in 1733. His forceful character and determined theological mind had no equal among his contemporaries. In the councils of the Bishops there is no one to replace him. Had he lived we may suppose that he would have made as great and decisive a contribution in the next theological struggle to emerge between the Bishops and the Edinburgh Presbyters as he had in the first struggle to establish Diocesan Episcopacy in the Church. Bishop Fullarton died in December 1739 and the Presbyters of Edinburgh

⁷⁰Cheyne, P. The Authority and Use of the Scottish Communion Office Vindicated, p. 20.

made application to the Bishops for a mandate to elect a successor

This application began a conflict between the Bishops and the Presbyters of Edinburgh which was to rage furiously until the outbreak of the Forty Five Rebellion. It was chiefly a theological battle about the right and proper place of the Second Order in the concept of Diocesan Episcopacy. In it the Bishops appear to uphold a position of absolute Episcopal Hierarchy against the stand taken by the Presbyters for the principles laid down in the Canons and the Concordat relating to the place, function and rights of the Second Order.

The first main theological conflict in the Church had been over the question of the "intrinsic right of the Church". The second theological conflict takes place over the "intrinsic rights of Presbyters". In the first conflict the College or King's Bishops defended a form of Jacobitism which allowed to the exiled King a position of absolute rule over the Church. In the new struggle the Bishops as a whole appear to defend the rights of the exiled King only as agreed in the secret clause to the Concordat of 1731.

For three years the See of Edinburgh remained vacant, its clergy holding frequent and angry meetings in complaint at the neglect of their See. In 1743 the Edinburgh clergy asked Bishop Rattray to take temporary charge of the Diocese. Rattray expressed his consent. This solution might have satisfied both Bishops and Presbyters, but Rattray died suddenly in May of that year. The reason given by Stephen for Rattray's willingness to take this step (in view of the secret clause of 1731) is that Rattray as Primus already considered himself Diocesan of the See,

since hitherto the Bishops of Edinburgh had always considered themselves to be metropolitans.⁷¹

On 20th August, 1743, the Bishops met in Conference at Edinburgh. Present were Keith, Falconer, Raitt and Alexander. Dunbar was absent through infirmity. At this Conference the Bishops drew up 16 Canons, which appear to have been designed to strengthen their own position as a hierarchical group.⁷²

The Primus was to be chosen from among them, but was to be only a President, and must call a meeting of Bishops on demand (Canon 2). The Primus was not to claim Metropolitan powers (Canon 3). Election by Presbyters in a vacant See could only be on mandate given by the Primus (Canon 4). A Dean was to be appointed in each Diocese (Canon 6). He was to be allowed to sit in all Synod Meetings, but had no "decisive voice" (Canon 11). A Bishop who had his dwelling or place of worship in the district of another Bishop was to be excluded together with his assistants and congregation from the jurisdiction of the Diocesan (Canon 9).⁷³

The Edinburgh Presbyters met in January, 1744, and protested against the 16 Canons.⁷⁴ They claimed that by the constitution of the Church of Scotland the Bishops alone could not hold a Synod, and consequently could not make Canons without the concurrence of

⁷¹Stephen, T. History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 289

⁷²Ibid., p. 294-295.

⁷³Ibid., p. 298-299: Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 348. Letter Bishop Falconer to Bishop Alexander, 18.10.1743, "I am told that Canon 9 sticks in the crop of our Edinburgh friends".

⁷⁴Stephen, T. History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 301.

the Presbyters who were an essential part of its constitution. An Act of Parliament made in the third session of the first Parliament of Charles II was produced in support of this claim. An Address stating their claims was sent to each Bishop, but no reply was ever received.⁷⁵

They argued that the power to elect a Bishop had been taken from them, since the Bishops had reserved the right to reject or elect without giving any reason, "only telling us that you have reasons which satisfy yourselves". They pointed out that they might make repeated nominations on this basis until they struck upon "the happy favourite" acceptable to the Bishops, "though perhaps least fit for us and the purposes of his high calling". The discontent of the Edinburgh Presbyters was so great that they rashly entered into correspondence with Bishop Smith, one of the Non Juring Bishops in England, who was promptly warned by Bishop Keith "in Gods name not to meddle in our affairs".⁷⁶

Stephen, apparently discounting the secret clause in the 1731 Concordat, or being ignorant of it, suggests that it was the Bishop's intention that Bishop Keith should become Bishop of Edinburgh. By their refusal to elect him the Edinburgh Presbyters were stubbornly frustrating this plan. If the

⁷⁵ Stephen, T. History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 301.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 305. Bishop Keith's letter to Bishop Smith, the English Non Juror, May 22nd, 1744; Scotichronion, Vol. II, p. 219 Letter from Keith to Smith, 21st April, 1744; Episcopal Chest MSS, No. 167. Bishop Keith's letter to the Other Bishops about Bishop Smith, July 12th, 1744

Edinburgh Presbyters, however, had shown signs of being willing to nominate Keith for election to the See of Edinburgh, would the Bishops have set aside the secret clause and proceeded to his election? Was the secret clause in reality only a plausible line of defence against the inroads upon their powers threatened by the disobedient Edinburgh Presbyters?

It may be doubted whether the real significance of the Edinburgh protest was fully understood by the Church as a whole. Bishop Alexander received numerous letters which indicate that a certain section of the clergy at least seemed happy enough to allow the Church to be dominated by a hierarchical Bench of virtually self-perpetuating Bishops.

Mr. Niving, of Torbex, writes: "The present situation calls for mature counsel and deliberation, and just now I shall duly put up my most earnest prayers that all of us and in a special manner those most nearly concerned may be inspired with wisdom from above to guard against the storm which is beginning already to blow and if not prevented by the calm and prudent management of those that sit at the helm threatens the wreck of our poor shattered vessel".⁷⁷

Mr. Livingston of Dunfermline, refers to them as "those rebellious factious fiery furious incendiaries of Edinburgh"⁷⁸ and hopes that they will stand "entirely upon their own legs".⁷⁹

⁷⁷Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 375. Letter from Rev. R. Niving to Bishop Alexander, 4.2.1744. Also - Letters to Bishop Alexander, Nos. 369, 374, 383, 387, 397.

⁷⁸Ibid., No. 388. Letter from Rev. A. Livingston, 30.3.1744.

⁷⁹Ibid., No. 413. Letter from Rev. A. Livingston, 15.8.1744.

Mr. Erskine of Muthil, referring to the Address made to the Bishops by the Edinburgh Presbyters, says - "They are strange fellows, just like the Presbyterians with the Government, always upon the catch, when they find you embarrassed to insist for some concessions from you".⁸⁰

The real problem the Church had to solve was how to apply the principles of the 1731 Concordat in such a way that they adhered also to the secret clause. Was it possible to strike a balance between Concordat and Clause, or must one be sacrificed at the cost of the other? If so which one? Inherent in this practical problem was the theological one: what was Diocesan Episcopacy? Whatever had been the conception of Diocesan Episcopacy accepted in 1731, could it be maintained in 1743? Was it not now essential that the rule of the Church be placed in the hands of a hierarchical Order of Bishops until such time as the political future of the Church was more certain? Was the position adopted by the Bishops in 1743 an attempt to safeguard the future of the Church so that if a Restoration took place a new erastian settlement of the Church would still be possible? Or, was the position taken up by the Bishops in 1743 a theological rejection of the principles for which Gadderar and his party had contended so strenuously?

Had the absolutism of the King been replaced by the absolutism of the Bishop? Did Diocesan Episcopacy simply mean

80.

Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 376, Letter from Rev. W. Erskyne, 8.2.1744

the rule of the Church by a College of self perpetuating Bishops, with no place at all in the Councils of the Church for either the Second Order or for the Laity?

There is no doubt that the Bishops faced some of these questions and their implications. Bishop Dunbar makes it plain to the Edinburgh Presbyters that he did not think that "the distressed Church of Scotland in her present situation ought or can be conformed to the state and forms of the Scottish Church Government as it stood before the Revolution" when he considered that "a Bishop in the Meetings with the Presbyters of his Diocese, acted only the part of a Presbyterian Moderator, but with far less presumption and arrogance".⁸¹

Whatever the strength of the Edinburgh Presbyter's' position, based on the principles contained in the 1731 Concordat, and however strongly they might protest against the deviations from it set forth in the 16 Canons of 1734, the defence offered by the Bishops for disregarding their protestations and for keeping the See of Edinburgh vacant was the secret clause of 1731.

Bishop Alexander says as much in his letter to the Presbyters in 1744: "Ye think fit to load us with the blame of what ye are pleased to term your long continued state or orphancy. But how unjustly and unfairly! Since most, if not all, of you know that it is not in our power to prevent it, and it is certain we

⁸¹Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 373. Letter from Bishop Dunbar to the Edinburgh Presbyters, 28.1.1744

do from our hearts regret it, as much as ye possibly do. I would have thought nevertheless that this ought not to be so much as hinted at in such a paper by men of any Discretion, for reasons neither proper nor useful to be told".⁸²

Fifteen years later, in 1759, Bishop Alexander felt it safe to explain the position of the Bishops more fully. They were impaled upon the horns of a dilemma, he says - if on the one hand they had applied to the exiled King, received a nomination from him, and consecrated a Bishop for the Diocese of Edinburgh, they would have suffered the rigours of the law, for the Government would conclude that they had been in correspondence with the exiled King.

If, again, they had consecrated a Bishop for Edinburgh without any reference to the exiled King, the result would have been the same, for the conclusions of the Government would have been the same. But if they had taken this step it would have severed the last practical cord which bound them to the exiled Royal House. Farquhar concludes that "so long as they remained Jacobites" to appoint an ordinary Diocesan Bishop to the See of Edinburgh was impossible.⁸³

One wonders what Gadderar's decision in this dilemma would have been. Would he have been on the side of the Edinburgh Presbyters for reasons of theological principle? Or for reasons of ecclesiastical statesmanship would he have sided with the Bishops?

⁸² Farquhar, G.T.S., Three Bishops of Dunkeld, p. 87

⁸³ Ibid., p. 88

Their tenuous link with the House of Stuart still weighed heavily with the Bishops. An illustration of this is to be seen in Bishop Dunbar's scruples October 1745, as to whether they should proceed to the election of a Bishop "now that a certain person (Prince Charles) is in the country".⁸⁴ With his suggestion to delay matters the other Bishops agreed. Perhaps the events of 1743-45 were influenced more by political hopes, vain as they turned out to be, than by fundamental theological concepts. On this assumption then the explanation given by Bishop Alexander in 1759 is acceptable. By that date, of course, the political aspirations of pre 1745, and the secret clause in the Concordat were dead. It was safe to admit it which is, perhaps, really all that Bishop Alexander was doing.

ENGLISH QUALIFIED EPISCOPACY

So far we have been dealing with the reactions to Jacobitism in the theology and policy of the Bishops between the Rebellions. Now we turn to look for reactions in the life of the Church as a whole. Such instances as we shall now deal with leave no doubt as to the determined and unshakable loyalty of the Scottish Episcopalians during those years to the exiled Royal House.

After the 1715 Rebellion an attempt was made by the Government to shut the Episcopal chapels in Edinburgh.⁸⁵ Legal difficulties

⁸⁴Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 481. Letter from Bishop Keith to Bishop Alexander, 17.10.1745.

⁸⁵Stephen, T. History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p.127; Chambers Domestic Annals, Vol. III, p. 405-6 gives a List of the Episcopal Chapels and the Names of the Clergy in Edinburgh at this time.

made it impossible, but the significant factor in the incident was that of the 22 Episcopal clergy involved 21 were fined for not conforming to the terms of the Toleration Act of Queen Anne's reign. That is, they refused to take the loyal Oaths.

In April, 1719, stringent measures were passed by the Government "for making more effectual the laws appointing the oaths for security of the Government to be taken by ministers and preachers in churches and meeting houses in Scotland". By this Act no Episcopal minister could officiate in any place where nine or more persons, in addition to the numbers of the household, were present, unless he had taken the Oath of Abjuration and prayed for the King. The penalty was 6 months imprisonment and the closing of the meeting house for the same period.

As a result of this Act a bitter division was begun within the Church. The Jacobite Non Juring Episcopalians refused to take the Oaths and pray for the Queen, and continued to organise their Church life under the severe limitations imposed upon them by law. In opposition to the Non Juring Meeting Houses there sprang up English Qualified Chapels.⁸⁶ These Chapels were ministered to by ministers in English orders. At first they recognised the Scottish Bishops, but when the Scottish Bishops refused to recognise them abreach occurred between the two parties which lasted until 1804. In that year the Church adopted

⁸⁶Farquhar, G.T.S., Episcopal History of Perth, p. 199 - deals with the split between Non Juror and English Qualified Meeting houses in Perth.

the 39 Articles of the Church of England as its standard of doctrine, and to a degree reconciled the two traditions, the Non Juror and the English Qualified, within one Scottish Episcopal church. In 1719, Mr. Small, who had followed his father in the charge in 1679, and remained until he was deprived in 1716, wrote a bitter letter to Bishop Rose about a rival Qualified Meeting House which had opened in Forfar.⁸⁷

In Aberdeen, in 1720, Dr. Burnet's old congregation held a meeting on 2nd May for the purpose of "settling ane Episcopal Meeting House by a qualified minister in terms of law". This was the founding of St. Paul's Episcopal Chapel. Their first minister was a Dr. Joseph Robertson from Forfar, who was in English Orders.⁸⁸

In Edinburgh, in 1722, an Episcopal Chapel, whose minister was qualified according to law, was founded by Lord Chief Baron Smith,⁸⁹ at the foot of Blackfriars Wynd, "with an altar and pulpit handsomely adorned".⁹⁰

A Qualified Episcopal Meeting House was established in Glasgow in 1712 by Mr. Cockburn, with the help of Sir Donald

⁸⁷Dill, R.W., Episcopacy in Forfar, p. 14-15; MS letter quoted by Stephen dated 4th August, 1719, History, Vol. IV, p. 153.

⁸⁸The Miscellany of the New Spalding Club, Second Volume, the Register of St. Paul's Episcopal Chapel Aberdeen, p. 10-11.

⁸⁹Arnot, Hugo, History of Edinburgh, p. 218

⁹⁰Chambers, Domestic Annals, Reign of George I, p. 480.

McDonald.⁹¹ In August, 1714 this Meeting House was pulled down by the mob, and Mr. Cockburn fled to Edinburgh.⁹² Mr. Duncan, however, later Bishop Duncan, continued to minister in Glasgow according to strict Jacobite principles. Wodrow reports an incident reputed to have taken place in 1721 when Mr. Duncan refused the Sacrament of Holy Communion to a dying English officer because he refused to confess to what in Mr. Duncan's eyes was mortal sin - taking a commission and serving against his rightful Sovereign, King James.

In 1728, an attempt was made by Mr. Duncan to set up a Non Juring Meeting House in James Corbets' land in the Broad Close. This venture fell foul of the City Magistrates, who insisted that if the King was not to be prayed for the door would be padlocked. Next year, Wodrow notes that "Mr. Duncan preaches to a few of the upright, stiff Jacobites (who will not join in places where the King is prayed for) in his own house. The rest go to the English Service, by the English Regiment minister".⁹³ The Qualified Chapel at Montrose goes back to 1696 when James Gordon was appointed.⁹⁴ In the first years of his ministry in Montrose Gordon freely baptized and celebrated the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But Privy Council action was taken against him, and he was forbidden to exercise

⁹¹Glasghu Facies, p. 220. Wodrow's Analecta November 3rd 1712

⁹²Ibid., 16th August, 1714.

⁹³Ibid., Analecta, 1721 and 1728. Also: Wodrow's Correspondence, Vol. III, p. 127. Letter to Mrs. Wodrow May 19th 1724. Wodrow makes the following comment: "Bishop Gadderar declares the Church of England schismatics, and all that support not their suffering Prince, the Pretender, in a state of damnation"

⁹⁴Henderson and Porter, Diary of James Gordon, Third Spalding Club, p. 14

his ministry any longer at Montrose. The Meeting House was closed. In 1718, however, after an exile in England Mr. James Gordon was again appointed to St. Peter's Episcopal Chapel, Montrose. In 1730, the Sederunt Book records that "by reason of the greatness of the congregation and Mr. Gordon their minister his advanced age", it was planned to give him a helper. Next year enquiries were made in London for "a Scots clergyman who will pray for the Government".⁹⁵ None was to be found.

It is clear from the Jolly Kist Letters that in 1732 St. Peter's was offered to Mr. Alexander, later Bishop Alexander. The offer was most attractive. The stipend was £50 sterling, and the promised tenure "as secure as any parish". Mr. D. Erskine, of Edinburgh, describes the congregation as "of its kind, the most considerable in Scotland". It had recently been "at the charge of building a fine chapel for their assembling to public worship, and therefore its not to be thought, that the Government will ever allow them to be served by one who will not so far comply with the law, as to pray, as it enjoins, for all in authority". Mr. Gordon, it appears, had "given full obedience to the law", not only in praying for the King but also in taking the Oaths to the Government.⁹⁶

It was hardly to be expected that John Alexander would consider himself suitable to follow in such a tradition. He refused the invitation to go to Montrose. And in July 1732, we

⁹⁵Henderson and Porter, Diary of James Gordon, Third Spalding Club, p. 16.

⁹⁶Jolly Kist MSS. Episcopal College, Edinburgh. No. 94. Letter from D. Erskine to J. Alexander, 27.1.1732.

find Mr. Moir of Edinburgh writing.⁹⁷ "As to Montrose there is an old English parson born of Scots parents who is to come down there at £60 per annum" (£10 more than was offered to Mr. Alexander). No one in Scotland, it appears, was prepared to take the Oaths, or pray for the King, for the sake of enjoying the high stipend and the secure tenure of the Qualified Chapel at Montrose. It is during this period, too, that the loyalty of some of the great families to the Jacobite cause begins to waver. In July, 1715, Bishop Rose wrote to Bishop Campbell complaining bitterly about the conduct of the Duke of Athole.⁹⁸ The Duke had caused Mr. Robertson, the Episcopal minister at Fortingall, to be summoned before the Circuit Court for not praying for King George. Mr. Robertson was fined £20, but on his return to his Meeting House he was summoned again on the same charge; this time to appear in Edinburgh. Rose says: "the proceeding of the Duke surprises many, he on the other hand pretends it a quarrel to the man and not the cause": an explanation which Rose at least gravely doubted.

The tone of Bishop Rose's letter, however, is mild compared to a letter from Bishop Gadderar to Bishop Campbell in May, 1723, on the same topic. Some Episcopalians on the Deskford Estates, five miles or so from Banff, finding themselves crowded in their minister's house, but for their own convenience, and against the

⁹⁷Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 103. Letter from J. Moir, Edinburgh to J. Alexander 28.7.1732.

⁹⁸Ibid., No. 1834. Letter from Bishop Rose to Bishop Campbell, 5.7.1715.

advice of their minister, had set up a Meeting House in one of "their own tenements". Lord Deskford, the proprietor of the Lands, gave instructions to his father's Sheriff Depute to take the necessary legal action, to "imprison" and "throw down the house". "This is the severest and most shocking thing that has happened since my return to this country", says Gadderar, "and it grieves me exceedingly both upon my Lords account, who from a friend is made a persecutor of us". Lord Deskford, had been a convinced Jacobite before the 1715. Gadderar ends his letter with a bitter prayer - "Lord, look down from heaven, behold and visit us in mercy, when our friends joyn with common enemies to persecute us".⁹⁹

The Jolly Kist contains numerous letters which show the grave financial effects upon the life of Non Juring Church which resulted from the withdrawal of support on the part of titled and landed families.¹⁰⁰ Outside the cities and large towns, the ministry in the country was almost entirely supported by private families who employed Episcopal ministers as tutors, and provided in their houses a place for public worship.

Gadderar obviously faced this situation in his Diocese. He writes to Campbell in 1723, saying: "Our adversaries on all hands are busy": "Popish priests in some corners", and

⁹⁹ Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 730. Letter from Bishop Gadderar to Bishop Campbell, 27.5.1723.

¹⁰⁰ Jolly Kist MSS, Nos. 171, 191, 262, 268, 237, /412: Also Farquhar's Hist. of Perth, p. 126, Letter from Mr. Blair to Bishop Keith. 303

"Presbyterian teachers", who, from his point of view seem to have been "too successful in making proselytes". "Well affected places are destitute for want both of ministers and maintenance": "Should it please the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers, provided with a bare subsistence, we might hope to see the country almost all cleared both of popery and presbytery".¹⁰¹

In 1729, the Duchess of Gordon, a daughter of the Earl of Peterborough, declared her adherence to the Protestant Religion and her intention to bring up her children in that Faith.¹⁰² Brought up in England and trained in the ways of the English Liturgy, she asked Mr. Cheyne, an Episcopal minister, to come to Gordon Castle as tutor to her family, and Chaplain to her household. With his Bishop's permission Mr. Cheyne took up this appointment at Gordon Castle.¹⁰³

At the end of 1730, however, in a letter from Mr. Moir to Mr. Alexander, giving him news about his recent visit to Aberdeen and Murray, he says: "The Duke of Gordon and his brother Lord Charles stay in the old town of Aberdeen and go to the Jurant Meeting House on the Lords Day".¹⁰⁴ At the end of 1731, there

¹⁰¹Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, No. 731. Letter from Bishop Gadderar to Bishop Campbell, 3rd September, 1723.

¹⁰²Acts of Assembly, 1729

¹⁰³Jolly Kist MSS, No. 75. Letter from Colin Petrie to J. Alexander telling him about Mr. Cheyne's appointment to Gordon Castle, 27.3.1729.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 86. Letter from J. Moir to J. Alexander 2.12.1730.

is a letter to Mr. Alexander from Colin Petrie of Auchentander giving more news of Mr. Cheyne, and the impossible position he had found himself in at Gordon Castle. "Mr. Cheyne is leaving the Castle at Whitsunday next, and has split on the rock Mr. Harper did".¹⁰⁵ That is, he had been unwilling to take the Oaths to the Government and pray for the King. Under these conditions the Duchess was not prepared to continue to have him as Chaplain to her household.

At the beginning of 1732, Colin Petrie sends Mr. Alexander more news of the Cheyne affair. Lord Aberdeen had asked both the Bishop of Aberdeen and the Bishop of Murray if they would allow a "qualified man" to be Chaplain at Gordon Castle. To which request both had replied that if the Duchess refused to hear a "right man", they would rather she heard a "Whig minister".¹⁰⁶

Restrictions imposed by Act of Parliament, the withdrawal of support from families that had at one time been strongly Jacobite, were not the only difficulties which the Non Juring Church had to face in maintaining its life.

Some of its old members were dying out and were not being replaced.¹⁰⁷ Mr. Livingston in a letter to Alexander, at the end of 1742, writes about the death of Mrs. Halket. The Halket

¹⁰⁵ Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 91. Letter from C. Petrie to J. Alexander, 20.12.1731.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., No. 93. Letter from C. Petrie to J. Alexander, 12.1.1732.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., Nos. 249, 312, 320, 453. Deal with the loss suffered by death of old members.

family was one of the strongest Jacobite families in his congregation. He believes that his congregation "has suffered more losses of this nature than any other within the nation".¹⁰⁸

Young men, too, who had been brought up in the principles of Jacobitism were finding it difficult to obtain positions in Scotland and were leaving the country. Dr. George Garden wrote a typical letter to Bishop Campbell commending a young man, James Irwin from Aberdeen. "A young man", he says, "of good principles with respect to Church and State, having no encouragement here because of his principles he goes from here to London".¹⁰⁹

Yet, in spite of every difficulty the cause of Jacobitism was vigorously supported by the great houses of Perthshire,¹¹⁰ Fingask, Strathallan, Drummond, Arbuthnot,¹¹¹ in the high glens of Angus and amid the wilds of Lochaber. Here was both refuge and protection still for Non Juring Chaplains and itinerant ministers. In microcosm this section of influential Scottish life is to be met also in the Records of the Non Juring Chapels in Edinburgh, in spite of the Union still a vigorous centre of Scottish national life. The Registers of Old St. Paul's, for

¹⁰⁸Jolly Kist MSS, No. 308. Letter from Mr. Livingston, Dunfermline, 1.12.1742.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., No. 765. Letter from Dr. George Garden to Bishop Campbell, 16th February, 1725.

¹¹⁰Melville, L., The Fair Land of Gowrie, The Parish of Kinnaird, p. 145.

¹¹¹Henderson, G.A., The Kirk of St. Ternan, (Arbuthnott)

example, tell of the support given by these Jacobite families to the Non Juring Church. Here is recorded the story of their domestic affairs, the baptism of their children, their marriages, the part they played in the management of Chapel business - Seaforth, Southesk, Montgomerie, Eglintoun, Lockhart of Carnwath, Wigton, St. Clair, Threipland of Fingask, John Murray of Pitcog, James Murray of Abercairney, John Murray of Broughton.¹¹²

Certainly the Non Jurant Church was not now as strong as it once had been, yet its position had become fairly well defined in Scottish life. It enjoyed no legal toleration. It hardly required one, for it had grown into a position of semi-social toleration: and Kirk Sessions and their Episcopal counterparts, at least in some of the East Coast towns, appear to have reached a common agreement in parish life over the support and care of the poor, orphan children, and shipwrecked sailors.¹¹³

Stephen gives the number of Episcopal congregations in 1745, just before the Rebellion, as upward of 300, and regarded the time as being ripe "for increasing prosperity" and for the "extension of the Church".

This time of acceptance and social toleration, if such it was, was soon to come to an end. In Stephen's melancholy words: "But as if God still had a controversy with her and intended still further to afflict and humble her, He permitted an event with

¹¹² Ingram, M.E., A Jacobite Stronghold of the Church, Old St. Pauls, Edinburgh, chapter IV.

¹¹³ Hill, J.P., The Episcopal Chapel at Muchalla, p. 9

which as a Church she had no concern to be the cause of the worst persecution which she had yet experienced".¹¹⁴

Only in so far as the Bishops made no official declaration in favour of the Young Pretender as had been given in Fetteresso in 1715 is Stephen's contention acceptable. Her great families provided the leadership of the Rebel Army. They raised their tenantry and clans and pressed men in support of the Prince. Her clergy went into the field with the Jacobite army as Chaplains. No word was ever uttered against the Rebellion by the Bishops. No warnings were given against this act of civil rebellion such as flowed from the Judicatories of the Established Kirk.

Perhaps the reason is not far to seek. The remnant Church was so firmly wedded to its Jacobitism that no declaration was necessary. The Forty-Five Rebellion was to prove that it was still stubbornly and proudly Jacobite. It was to remain so, in spite of Penal laws, and in spite of the weary years of persecution which now lay ahead.

¹¹⁴ Stephen, T., History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p.317.

CHAPTER 8

THE SECOND REBELLION

To the Rebellion of 1745 the reactions of both Presbyterians and Episcopalians were violent. The Rebellion presented the Episcopalians with a last desperate chance to declare their Jacobite Faith - even at the cost of martyrdom. To the Presbyterians the Pretender's Rising represented a last desperate gamble to bring back the bloody hand of Stuart.

Some attention is given to the aftermath of the Rebellion as it is presented in the Albemarle Papers. A few cases of discipline resulting from participation or suspected participation in the Rebellion were dealt with by the Church Courts. In no way was the situation in parish life or in presbytery comparable to the situation which existed after the 1715 Rebellion. In many parishes militant Episcopalian Jacobitism had died out.

The Jolly Kist Letters tell the human story of the Episcopalians under the Penal Acts. Not unnaturally the division between the Non Jurant Jacobites and the English Qualified Episcopalians hardens. It is maintained with great bitterness until the death of Prince Charles Edward, and is not finally resolved until the Union between them in 1804.

The question which the study of this period raises is one to which it provides no answer. If the lineal descent of the Royal House had not failed would there still be a Jacobite Episcopalian remnant in Scottish ecclesiastical life? There is every reason to believe that this would be so. One also wonders how far the conception of the Divinely ordered Bishop derives some of its absolutism from the theory of the Divinely ordered King, and whether the absolutism of theological Jacobitism lives on still in the guise of an absolute conception of Episcopacy itself?

Serious Warnings

Presbyterians in Arms

Cases of Discipline

Jacobite Chaplains

The Albemarle Papers

More Jolly Kist Letters

Non Juror and English Qualified

SERIOUS WARNINGS

In 1744 the General Assembly sent up an Address to the King on the present critical juncture of National Affairs. They testified their abhorrence and resentment of the recent attempt to invade, with French aid, His Majesty's Kingdoms, in support of the claims of the Popish Pretender.

Great Sir, they said, we reflect with particular pleasure, that the ministers and members of this Church have always distinguished themselves by their firm and resolute adherence to the Protestant Succession, in your Majesty's Royal Family. They assured the King that in the present critical situation they were influenced by the same loyal principles, and were equally concerned for the security of the Reformed Religion. They promised that they would steadily pursue the laudable example set them by their predecessors, and hoped to show even in time of the greatest danger that they counted nothing too dear in support of the King's suspicious Government "the great bulwark, under God, of our Religion, Laws and Liberties".¹

Next year the future of the established Presbyterian Kirk, which had linked itself "inseparably" with the illustrious House of Hanover, was to be put in considerable jeopardy, by the Jacobite Rising of 1745.

The Church of Scotland's awareness of the dangers which now threatened is shown very clearly in the Admonitions and Seasonable

¹ Acts of Assembly, 1744. An Address to his Majesty upon occasion of the present Critical Juncture of Affairs, 21st May, 1744.

Warnings which were issued by the Commission of Assembly, Synods and Presbyteries to the people of Scotland.

The Serious Warning issued by the Synod of Dumfries on 24th September, 1745,² was one of the first of such documents. It conveys the contemporary sense of indignation and horror at what was taking place, and shows the attempt made by the Church to rouse men to an urgent sense of their danger and to determination to fight for their principles and their Reformed Faith. "We the ministers of the Provincial Synod of Dumfries on account of the melancholy situation of affairs at this juncture, judge it our duty to God, and a just and necessary service we owe to our most gracious Sovereign King George, our country, ourselves and our posterity, to warn persons of all ranks of the imminent danger of Popery and Slavery to which these lands are exposed by the present unnatural rebellion, raised in favour of a Popish Pretender, headed by a son of his, educated at Rome in all the maxims of Popery and Arbitrary Government."

"When the rebels have in so short a time made such an alarming progress, when they have got possession of the capital of our country and defeat a part of his Majesty's troops that engaged them, when our Religion, our Liberties, our excellent Constitution in Church and State are in such imminent danger, it

²Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Dumfries, 24th September, 1745, also Admonition Synod of Galloway, Wigtown, 15th October, 1745; Admonition, Arbroath Presbytery, Arbroath, 13th November, 1745; Admonition, Inveraray Presbytery, Glasrie, 9th October, 1745.

is high time to awake out of sleep and shake off that indifference and lukewarmness which have seized too many. Indifference in such case is criminal, and as a heathen observed, when our country is in danger, the man that is neutral or indifferent is an enemy.

"Let none deceive themselves and vainly imagine their religion and liberties may be safe should the present Government and Protestant Succession in the illustrious House of Hanover be overturned, which God forbid. For in that melancholy event a Papist must ascend the throne of these lands and the person who calls himself Regent and heads the present rebellion doth not pretend to be Protestant and is credibly reported hath for his chief counsellor and general a noted Papist descended from the Earl of Antrim deeply concerned in the Irish massacre.

"For any person acquainted with the history of the Pretender's family and their education at Rome to think they are Protestants must be a strange delusion, and a bait by which we hope no thinking person will be caught. As he is a Papist in whose favours the present rebellion is raised, so no regard is to be paid to his promises or declarations of whatever sort, for it is a point established by the Council of Constance that no faith is to be kept with hereticks, and all Protestants are such in their account, and whatever they may pretend they have on various occasions acted generally to this principle and violated the most sacred promises and solemn oaths, of which several instances are on record in history, and can we imagine that a Popish Pretender suspected of a spurious birth and raised to the British Throne by

the combined force of France and Spain, these cruel and treacherous enemies, will protect us in the free enjoyment of our rights and priviledges, will he not ever be under the influence of these Popish powers with whom he is so greatly indebted, by his religion he must be a slave to Rome, by his interest and policy he must receive laws from France and will he not be reckoned a monster of ingratitude if he do not raise his friends, the declared enemies of our religion and liberty to the chief places of power and trust in the nation? And for a Protestant to think himself safe in the exercise of his religion and liberties under such a Government must be a great delusion.

"Whoever reads and considers the hardships and sufferings to which our forefathers were exposed in the reign of King Charles II and James 7th and the great and arbitrary encroachments made upon our constitution both in Church and State in that persecuting period, notwithstanding of the most solemn engagements to the contrary would not wish these severities received upon himself and his children, who would dread the thoughts of having one, who boasts of such ancestors, raised to the British throne. And must he not be willingly blind who expects so much as a Toleration should the present Rebellion succeed? A review must make every one sensible of the blessings enjoyed by us since the late happy Revolution and that our present condition is as much preferable to what we can expect if this Government be overturned as light is to darkness and freedom to slavery.

"Whatever grievances may be alledged they are not comparable to those our fathers suffered, nor to those we must expect to suffer if the Pretender be raised to the throne of these lands, which we

hope in God will never be the case".

The Warning then deals with "the fair promises artfully made" by the Jacobites "to serve a turn" and deceive the unwary. It deals with the threat of a standing army, and has something to say about the Stuart kings' conception of Kingship. "It is well known that by the Constitution of Britain the king is so much obliged to rule by law, as the subjects are bound to obey, and it is evident from the history of this kingdom that when the King hath assumed to himself an arbitrary and despotick power the subjects after all other methods tryed, but tryed in vain, to bring him to a better mind have set him aside and placed another on the throne having still on such occasions as much regard as possible for the lineal succession, and it is always to be considered that Britain is not like to an estate whereof the King is the proprietor and the people mere tenants at will, much less slaves to his pleasure".

Finally, the Synod "recommended to all their number to be very careful both in public and private to lay before their people the errors of Popery and to warn them of the danger of Popery and the reintroduction of Prelacy and the intire subversion of the Presbyterian government of this Church now happily enjoyed by us, agreeable to and founded on the word of God, and inviolably secured to us by our Revolution and Claim of Right, and other fundamental laws of the Kingdom. And to beget in the people a just sense of the miseries of arbitrary power and to guard them against all wicked and undue arts that may be made use of to alienate their minds from the present royal family and happy constitution and to stir them up to courage and resolution in

defence of the religion and liberation of their country letting them know that if they shall vigorously appear for their valuable interests, they may through the help of God, confidently hope from the cause and the frequent interpositions of a kind Providence in former times, in support of it, that it shall not now be suffered to sink, but will gloriously triumph over the present wicked opposition. And further in acting for this noble cause to be of good courage, to play the man for our people and the Citys of our God, and the Lord to that which seemeth him good".

In Synod after Synod the issues raised by the Rebellion were clearly set forth. Everything that Jacobitism stood for the Church was against entirely. It feared the return of the House of Stuart as it feared little else.

The Warning of the Synod of Merse and Teviotdale³ runs to 7 pages in the Minute Book and touches upon such subjects as - "The monstrous idol of indefeasible right", the horror of the Spanish Inquisition, the French and Irish massacres, the Highland host, the "barbarous torture hanging and quartering of Charles II's reign", and puts before its people the "remarkable" historical fact: "That the Church of Scotland as now established and the civil liberties of the subjects have always stood or fallen together".

The Synod of Clydesdale,⁴ meeting at Glasgow, deals no less

³Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Merse and Teviotdale, Kelso, 15th October, 1745.

⁴Ibid., Synod of Clydesdale (Ayr and Glasgow), Glasgow, 1st October, 1745.

forcefully with the issues of the day, but ends its long Admonition with a prayer for the Jacobite rebels - "Whilst we pray ardently that God may utterly defeat their wicked designs let us with the same ardour pray that He may open their eyes to see the evil of them, and by awakening their conscience, lead them to repentance".

The Synod of Moray,⁵ because the state of the Kingdom rendered it very difficult for them to send up their Address of Loyalty without considerable fear of it falling into the wrong hands, had two fair copies made of the Address. They had one sent to Duncan Forbes, the Lord President of the Council, at his house at Culloden, and the other to the Honourable Master of Grant, Member of Parliament, at his house at Castle Grant.

Edinburgh Presbytery was unable to meet during the Prince's occupation of the city. The entry in the Presbytery Minute for 25th September,⁶ 1745, reads: "There was no meeting of Presbytery this day in regard an army of Highlanders and others from the North Country are presently in this place with the Pretender's eldest son at their head." "There was no meeting of the Presbytery in October 'for the same reason before mentioned'".⁷ But on 14th November the Presbytery was called "by a warrand from the Moderator", "the rebels having marched South", and promptly

⁵Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Synod of Moray, Elgin, 16th October, 1745.

⁶Ibid., Edinburgh Presbytery, 25th September, 1745.

⁷Ibid., 30th October, 1745.

sent up a Loyal Address to the King in which they assured him "that the people under our pastoral care, far from being seduced by the arts of the surrounding rebels to their wicked and treacherous designs, are more and more convinced that their only security for all that is dear and valuable to them as men and Christians entirely depends, under God, on the preservation of your Majesty's Government and our happy constitution".⁸

PRESBYTERIANS IN ARMS

Presbyterian Scotsmen did more, however, than merely issue Seasonable Warnings and Admonitions. In their eyes the Pretender's eldest son was no romantic Prince in a Ruritarian landscape come to claim his rightful Crown out of which he had been tricked by villanous and evil subjects. He was the representative of the hated, despotick, tyrannical and Popish House of Stuart. He, and his claims, had to be resisted by force of arms. Volunteers were not lacking for King George's militia. The Divinity students in Edinburgh were well represented in Provost Drummond's College Company. Among them was John Home, afterwards minister at Athelstaneford, author of "Douglas"; William Robertson, afterwards minister at Gladsmuir; Hugh Bannatine, son of the minister of Trinity College, afterwards minister at Ormiston; Mr. Kinloch, a Probationer, son of one of the Ministers of the High Kirk; and the redoubtable Alexander

⁸Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Edinburgh Presbytery, 14th November, 1745.

Carlyle, afterwards minister of Inveresk. Carlyle tells in his Autobiography⁹ how they were drilled and taught arms-drill by a serjeant, a process which was not altogether new to him since he had been taught the use of arms by his father, who had been a volunteer in Queen Anne's reign "when there was a clamour about the Pretender".

Professor McLaurin¹⁰ tried to make the walls on the South side of the city more readily defensible, and had some small cannons erected near to the Potterrow Port. Bruce of Kennet,¹¹ a member of a Presbyterian family distinguished for its conduct during the Fifteen Rebellion, came into the city bringing with him a hundred men he had raised for the defence of Edinburgh, while Sir Robert Dickson joined the Volunteer Force with about 140 men whom he had raised from Musselburgh and the parish of Inveresk.

Patrick Simpson,¹² minister at Fala, raised and drilled a small company of his parishioners, and marched at their head to the battle of Prestonpans.

John Home followed in the wake of the Government army at Prestonpans, but the battle was over before he got there. At Falkirk, however, he was more actively engaged and was taken prisoner together with several clerical companions, Patrick

⁹Burton, J. H. Autobiography of Dr. Alexander Carlyle, p. 121

¹⁰Warrick, J. The Moderators of the Church of Scotland, 1690-1740 p. 350.

¹¹Gordon, T. Crowther, History of Clackmannan, p. 136

¹²Hunter, J. Fala and Soutra, p. 88-89; Fasti, Vol. I, p. 319 - Simpson

Simpson, James Smith, of Garvock, Andrew McVey, of Dreghorn, and John Wotherspoon, who later was to become the Principal of Princeton, U.S.A.¹³

The Rebellion provided the Seceders with the opportunity for showing that they too were as loyal subjects of the Crown as the members of the Established Kirk.

After the battle of Prestonpans the Synod of the Secession Church met at Stirling, in September, 1745, and issued an Address to their people very similar in content to those sent out by the Synods of the Established Kirk.¹⁴

If they were to bear arms, however, they would bear arms independently of any other force. At the Synod Meeting, in April, 1746, it was agreed that the Seceders should not be incorporated with those who had refused to testify against the corruptions in Church and State, but should be enrolled as a separate body of men. They proposed to form a Seceder's Regiment, with its own officers and chaplain, to be armed and paid according to Act of Parliament, but to be exempted from taking the usual military oath, and to remain in being until after the Rebellion had been quelled.¹⁵

¹³Fasti, Vol. I, p. 354 - Home; Vol. III, p. 88 - McVey; Vol. V, p. 470 - Smith; Vol. III, p. 174 - Wotherspoon; Also Tayler A. & H. Jacobite Letters to Lord Pitligo, 1745-46, p. 48; Baikie, W.B. Origins of the Forty Five. Scottish History Society, Second Series, Vol. II, p. 198.

¹⁴McKerrow, J., History of the Secession Church, p. 199

¹⁵Ibid., p. 200.

The Rebellion had been suppressed however before this interesting proposal could ever be put into effect. Even before the subject of taking up arms was raised in the Synod a Corps of Volunteers had already been formed by some of the Secession congregations. When General Hawley was in Edinburgh making preparations for the defence of the City against Rebel attack, a force of 300 Seceders was raised and armed for the defence of the City.¹⁶

During the occupation of Edinburgh by the Rebels Adam Gib assembled his people for worship at Dreghorn on five successive Sundays. In spite of the fact that armed Highland soldiers stood on the fringe of his congregation he prayed openly for King George, expressed forcibly his horror of the Rebellion, and prayed vigorously for the defeat of the Highland army.¹⁷

When news reached Edinburgh that the Highlanders were returning from England, and it was feared that they might come again to the capital, Adam Gib's Seceders were again called upon by the Sheriff to play their part in the defence of the City.¹⁸

Glasgow Seceders fought at Falkirk, and the aged Ebenezer Erskine raised some 60⁰ volunteers for the defence of Stirling. On the night when it was expected that the town would be attacked he presented himself at the town guard room. On being urged to

¹⁶ McKerrow, J. History of the Secession Church, p. 201

¹⁷ Scots Magazine, Vol. XXVII. Letter from Adam Gib, June 14th, 1765.

¹⁸ McKerrow, J. History of the Secession Church, p. 202.

go home and say his prayers, his reply was: "I am determined to take the hazard of the night along with you, for the present crisis requires the arms as well as the prayers of all good subjects".¹⁹

The ultra conservative Cameronian element in Presbyterianism made plain their attitude towards Prince Charles in what must surely be one of the most vicious, condemnatory pamphlets ever penned, "The Active Testimony of the True Presbyterians of Scotland". This document testifies against and condemns in indistinguishable terms the Houses of Orange, Hannover and Stuart. It protests against the "usurped supremacy", "hell hatched Toleration" and "tyranny" of that "bloody, idolatrous Jesuitical Papist James, Duke of York", whom it describes as "deserving a halter rather than a crown".²⁰ It bewails the sin of the land in receiving the Houses of Orange and Hannover, "without regard to, or requiring Scripture and Covenant Qualifications in them", and accuses their representatives, William, Anne and the Georges of having exercised "an usurped Erastian Power over the Church", "settling a mock Presbyterian Government" upon the Church, thereby "denying it to be of Divine right", "for their own conveniency and worldly ease".

¹⁹McKerrow, J. History of the Secession Church, p. 203. For Seceders and the Forty Five see also - Adam Gib's Display, Vol. II p. 248, 250; Memoirs of Ebenezer Erskine, Fraser, p. 439-446; Adam Gib, the Anti Burgher by D. M. Forrester, SCHS, Vol. III.150.

²⁰The Active Testimony of the True Presbyterians in Scotland, p. 9

Thus they fulminated with a plethora of abusive adjectives against "all the enemies of Christ at home and abroad", but in particular against the two principle factions, "one adhering to the Duke of Hannover" and the other "adhering to a Popish Pretender".²¹

John Bisset's Diary gives an account of what was taking place in Aberdeen, as seen through the eyes of one of the staunchest Whig ministers of the time. On October 5th, 1745, he notes: "all of us prayed express as before (for King George) and against the troubler of Israel: and ever since this work (the Rebellion) began, hath preached and prayed more express, if more express could be than before".²²

Aberdeen in the Forty Five, however, was not the Aberdeen of the Fifteen. The fiery, exuberant Jacobite loyalties of twenty years before have faded out. Bisset notes that both Lord Lewis Gordon and the Laird of Stoneywood have difficulty raising recruits: and, is delighted to hear reports that "when the drum beats, not a few of the boys cry, God save King George".²³

At the Grammar School some of the masters dropped King George's name from their prayers, but the boys cried out the King's name at the appropriate place in the prayers. In the streets, Bisset says, there were loyal cries of, "King George for ever:

²¹ The Active Testimony of the True Presbyterians in Scotland, p. 16-17

²² Miscellany of the Spalding Club, Vol. I. John Bisset's Diary, p. 349.

²³ Ibid., p. 352

Down with the Popish Pretender: Back to Rome with him".²⁴

It is evident from various letters written to the Laird of Stoneywood that the parish ministers in Aberdeen and Banff used their influence to prevent recruits joining the Rebel army. Lord Lewis Gordon found it extremely difficult to raise Cess in Banffshire. He had to use "great threatenings" and "a seeming violence" to counteract the "unnatural methods the ministers and other disaffected people make use of to restrain the people from doing their duty".²⁵

Another of Stoneywood's correspondents, Hugh Innes, a student at King's College, Aberdeen, complained that after he had engaged several "servant lads" for the Prince's service they were induced to withdraw by "the diabolical lyes of their Presbyterian preacher".²⁶

The minister of Logie Mar, where the Laird, Colonel Charles Gordon of Blelock, was away with the Prince's army, continued to pray expressly for King George and the defeat of the Rebel army in spite of the public protest made at his prayer by the Laird's mother from her pew in the Church.²⁷

²⁴Miscellany of the Spalding Club, Vol. I, John Bisset's Diary, p. 353

²⁵Ibid., Letters to the Laird of Stoneywood, p. 410.

²⁶Ibid., p. 422

²⁷Ibid., Preface, p. 81.

In Ross and Sutherland the loyal example and exhortations of the ministers did not meet with the success it appears to have had in Aberdeen and Banff. The Synod of Ross and Sutherland in a Loyal Address to the King, after the Victory at Culloden, express their "very deep regret" that so many in their bounds were concerned in the Rebellion, including "some of considerable rank in the country"; but they took pleasure in assuring the King that "few of them were of our communion". Many of their greatest families had opposed the Rebellion "to the utmost". Some of their oldest families of "untainted principle" and "steady adherence to Revolution principles" had "suffered deeply both in their lives and fortunes".²⁸

Such was Duncan Forbes of Culloden, elder of the Kirk and Lord President. During the Fifteen and again in the FortyFive Rebellion he committed himself and his resources to the service of the Government, an action which, it appears, was never adequately recognised.²⁹

Sir James Fergusson, in his book "John Fergusson 1727-1750 (Lord Kilkerran)", presents the view of a group of Ayrshire Presbyterian families on the 1745 Rising. They regarded it as an unmitigated disaster, which did irreparable harm to Scotland, especially in her relations with England.

It is clear from Dr. Doddridge's letters to Lord Kilkerran

²⁸Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Synod of Ross and Sutherland, Cromarty, 23rd April, 1746.

Menray, G.

²⁹See -/Life and Letters of Duncan Forbes of Culloden, p. 21-26, 194-294. Omond, The Lord Advocates of Scotland, p. 322-862, Culloden Papers, Nos. 246, 247, 251, 294, 405, 407, 417.

that English opinion considered all Scotsmen to be tainted with Jacobite sentiments; and that this canker had eaten its way even into the Established Church. "The behaviour of the town of Edinburgh", writes Lord Kilkerran, "may have led your people to think oddly of Scotland, but they will by this be let to see that they are not from the behaviour of one place to form the character of the whole people. You may depend upon it that the Presbyterians of Scotland are to a man firm to the present establishment. The distinction of partys here is so far different from what it is with you that the Episcopal only in this country are generally Jacobite".³⁰ He repeats these views to Lord Halifax in a letter written several weeks later. "I have let the Doctor (Doddridge) know with how little reason it is that the generality of this country are in England suspected of disloyalty. I can assure your Lordship that but a small number of the low country other than persons of desperate circumstances have joined the Highlanders, and that the far greatest and best part of this part of the United Kingdom are firmly attached to our present happy constitution and ardently wish success to the measures for the preservation of religion and liberty and for the glory and peace of the country".³¹

In May, 1746, Lord Kilkerran writes again to Doddridge: "I have hints from England that we are in general looked on as a

³⁰Fergusson, James, John Fergusson 1727-1750., p. 113. Lord Kilkerran's letter to Dr. Doddridge, November 22nd, 1745.

³¹Ibid., p. 119. Lord Kilkerran's letter to Lord Halifax, December, 2nd, 1745.

rebellious people". Apparently the delay in sending down the Earl of Leven's Commission as Commissioner to the General Assembly was looked upon as being indicative of this English point of view. Kilkerran angrily repudiates this slur upon the good name of the Church of Scotland. "There is not a set of men on earth", he writes, "more attached to a Government than the Church of Scotland is to the Protestant succession".³²

During the Forty Five Alexander Macbean was minister of the first charge Inverness. He used his influence to champion the Government's cause, and nearly lost his life as a bystander at the battle of Culloden.³³ When the city of Aberdeen was occupied by the Rebels Bisset and his colleagues preached defiantly against them.³⁴ At Dundee the ministers preached until the town was overrun by armed men.³⁵

The ministers of Glencairn, Kirknewton, Kintore and Rayne acted as couriers and guides to the Duke of Cumberland's forces on their advance to the North.³⁶

At Kelso, James Ramsay, veteran of Border resistance during the Fifteen, once again played a leading part in dissuading his

³²Fergusson, James, John Fergusson 1727-1750, p. 178. Lord Kilkerran's Letter to Dr. Doddridge, May 19th, 1746.

³³Baikie, W.B., Origins of the Forty Five, SHS, Vol. II, pLIII-LV

³⁴Ibid., John Daniels Progress, p. 189-202; Miscellany of the Spalding Club, Vol. I, John Bisset's Diary, p. 349

³⁵Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Dundee Presbytery, 4th September and 30th October, 1745.

³⁶Currie, J. Glencairn, p. 99; Fasti, Part I, p. 143; Origins of the Forty Five, p. 140-141

Jacobite parishioners from joining the Prince's army as it passed through Kelso,³⁷ while the ministers of Peeblesshire were actively engaged in raising volunteers for the King's militia.³⁸

In Edinburgh, twelve of the city ministers and the Divinity professors petitioned the Lord Provost and Magistrates that the city ought to be put in "a proper posture of defence against the common enemy", and "engaged" cheerfully to contribute for defraying the necessary expense with their fellow citizens. The ministers themselves contributed for the support of one hundred men out of the proposed force of one thousand. The ministers were most anxious that the city be adequately defended, and at the meeting held in the New Church Aisle on 16th September, vigorously pursued this end and proposed, through their spokesman, Rev. George Logan, that the dragoons who had been sent to join Cope at Dunbar be brought back. The meeting appears, however, to have been packed with disaffected persons. Mr. Logan, and the others, who "attempted to speak in opposition to surrender were borne down with clamour and noise".³⁹ Perhaps, if the advice of the ministers had been followed Edinburgh would never have been taken. At least Carlyle's view was that if the Whig party in the Town Council had put Provost Stewart under arrest at the first threat of danger the city would have held out.⁴⁰

³⁷ Warrick, Moderators of the Church of Scotland, p. 335

³⁸ Chambers, W. Peebleshire, Peebles Burgh Records, January 8th, 1746, p. 226

³⁹ Warrick, Moderators of the Church of Scotland, p. 381

⁴⁰ Carlyle, Autobiography, p. 123

On the capture of Edinburgh by the Highlanders most of the ministers left the city. Two remained, Mr. Hog of the Tron Kirk, and Neil McVicar of the West Port Kirk, who was able "under countenance of the Castle guns" to pray for King George, and, also in forthright terms for "the young men who had come to their city seeking a crown".⁴¹

In the Scots Magazine, October, 1745,⁴² there appeared a plea to the City ministers, allegedly made by the heads of families, to return to their Kirks. Its argument was that their parishioners might go to worship in the Episcopal Chapels and be lost to the Kirk, and it suggested that if it was dangerous to pray for King George they should pray in general for all Christian Kings and Princes. This Jacobite inspired document was disregarded by the Edinburgh ministers.

The most complete and final way in which the ministers of Edinburgh could show their hostility towards the Invader of their Country was to desert the City. In no way could they be charged with giving any countenance whatsoever towards his claims. In this way they were able to show a supreme contempt for his pretensions, and an utter disdain for his promises. They did this at some personal cost to their households. Logan and Bannatine⁴³ for instance, both had their houses ransacked and

⁴¹History of the West Kirk, p. 119; Wilson, Memorials of Edinburgh Scots Magazine 21st September, 1745, p. 147; Old Edinburgh Club, Article by Baikie, p. 35.

⁴²Scots Magazine, October, 1745, p. 462. A Jacobite inspired Letter to the Ministers of Edinburgh to return to their Pulpits.

⁴³Warrick, Moderators of the Church of Scotland, p. 380 and 365, Woodhouselee MSS.

occupied by the Highlanders.

This public gesture of defiance and contempt was surely to be expected from men with an unshakable confidence in the rightness of their cause and in the over ruling providence of God. The elder Carlyle, minister of Prestonpans, the Sunday after the battle, when the spirits of all but the staunchest Presbyterians must have been at a very low ebb, continued to pray fervently for King George, and warned his people "against being seduced by appearances to believe that the Lord was with the rebels, and that their cause would in the end be prosperous".⁴⁴

There are some significant changes between the 1715 and 1745 Jacobite Manifestos⁴⁵ which would indicate that the Pretender was aware of the changes in Scottish ecclesiastical life that had taken place between the two Rebellions. In 1715, and again in 1745, the Pretender declares against the Union, and promises a free Scottish Parliament. In Church matters, however, there was clearly promised in 1715 a restoration of the just rights of the Church "on their ancient foundation"; which all Episcopalians read as referring to them. In 1745, however, Prince Charles declares that it is his father's intention "not to impose upon any a religion which they dislike, but to secure them all in the enjoyment of those which are respectively at present established among them, either in Scotland, England or Ireland; and it shall be deemed proper that any further security be given to

⁴⁴ Autobiography of Dr. Alexander Carlyle, p. 159

⁴⁵ Mathieson, W.L., Scotland and the Union, p. 366; Prince Charles first Manifesto, p. 365.

the established Church or clergy we hereby promise in his name that he shall pass any law his Parliament shall judge necessary for that purpose".

In 1745, then, whatever the Jacobite Episcopalians hoped to derive from the success of the Rising, the Prince Regent did not come openly as the Restorer of their Church, indeed, his promise appears to be the very reverse.

His promise, as far as the Established Church was concerned, was not worth the paper it was written on. Presbyterians already enjoyed all the security they could possibly wish for, and regarded the very presence of the Prince Regent as a mortal threat to their own existence.⁴⁶

Nor was the Pretender's claim to the Crown of Scotland on the basis of indefeasible hereditary right given any great credence.

The Rev. George Logan⁴⁷ wrote several long and learned treatises on this subject which demolished its demand to be taken with any historical seriousness. An article in the Scots Magazine in March 1745 treats this claim of the House of Stuart to the Crown by Divine Right with popular ridicule and contempt.

⁴⁶Scots Magazine, 10th October, 1745, p. 562. A Letter in Answer to the Pretender's oldest Son, by way of answer to his second Manifesto; Also Scots Magazine March 1746, p. 120. Article - The Right of the House of Stewart to the Crown of Scotland.

⁴⁷John Logan's Pamphlets - 1. A Treatise on Government, showing that the right of the Kings of Scotland to the Crown was not strictly and absolutely hereditary, 1746; 2. A Second Treatise on Government showing that the Right to the Crown of Scotland was not Hereditary in the sense of the Jacobites, 1747; 3. The Finishing Stroke, or Mr. Ruddiman Self Condemned, 1748; 4. The Finishing Stroke or Mr. Ruddiman more Self Condemned, 1748; 5. The Doctrine of the Jure-Divine-ship of Hereditary and Indefeasible Monarchy entered into and exploded in a Letter to Mr. Thomas Ruddiman, 1749.

No true Scotsman, it was asserted, can fail to be fired with indignation when he is told that he belongs to a race that has never been free or independent, but has always been the property of a certain family, who claim we are their inheritance, on the basis of divine hereditary right.

No man of commonsense believes this. It is the grossest affront capable of being offered. Jacobites may hug their chains and be proud to be slaves, but there are still some among us who imagine themselves free, the property of no King or Pretender whatever.

No person or family has ever had a divine, hereditary, indefeasible right to govern Scotsmen. The House of Stewart did for many years possess the throne of Scotland but it was not by virtue of such a right. The first of that race that ever reigned, reigned by the consent of a free people, and the authority of a Parliament.

Will the Jacobites please tell us by what right Robert Bruce came to the throne of Scotland? Nor were the readers of the Scots Magazine left in ignorance of the views of English Churchmen about events in Scotland.⁴⁸ The Archbishop of York formed an Association for the defence of York, and his speech made to this Association was reported in September 1745. The Archbishop of Canterbury's letter to the clergy of his Diocese was reported the

⁴⁸Scots Magazine for Sept. and Oct. 1745, p. 426-460 printed several Addresses and Speeches from England about the Rebellion. Address by County of York, 24th Sept.; Speech made by the Archbishop of York; Association founded by the Archbishop for the Defence of York; Letter sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the clergy of his Diocese, 9th Sept; Bishop of Durham's letter to his clergy, 22nd Oct; Bishop of Hereford's letter to his clergy, 20th Sept; From Scottish sources there appeared, p. 462. Warning by the Synod of Glasgow, 1st Oct; Warning by the Commission of Assembly, 13th and 15th Nov; Address by Ministers of the City of Edinburgh, 12th Nov; A Memorial concerning unnatural Rebellion read in the Church at Ormiston, 10th Nov.

same month; as were the letters of the Bishops of Hereford and Durham to their clergy, together with several Memorials, Humble Addresses and Seasonable Warnings from such bodies as the Synod of Glasgow, the Commission of the General Assembly, and the Ministers of the City of Edinburgh.

On 19th May, 1746, the General Assembly duly addressed his Majesty upon the Victory obtained by his army, under command of H.R.H. The Duke of Cumberland, who was referred to in fulsome terms as "our Second Deliverer, and Restorer of those blessing procured by another glorious Prince of that name at the late happy Revolution."⁴⁹

The University of St. Andrews sent a deputation to wait upon the Duke and presented him with a Congratulatory Address requesting that he should become their Chancellor.

With the Duke of Cumberland's installation as Chancellor of the University of St. Andrews⁵⁰ the history of the once strongly Jacobite University had come round full circle. The loyal Addresses sent by the University to James II in 1688, full of fervour for the illustrious House of Stuart, belonged to an age that had gone for ever.

⁴⁹ Acts of Assembly, 1746. Congratulatory Address, to his Majesty upon the Victory obtained by his Army, under command of H.R.H. the Duke of Cumberland, over the Rebels in this Country, 19th May; Congratulatory Letter to H.R.H. William Duke of Cumberland, 20th May; Act for a Thanksgiving, 22nd May.

⁵⁰ Lyon, History of St. Andrews, Vol. II, p. 133

CASES OF DISCIPLINE

When the Rebellion was over Presbyteries proceeded to deal with those of their number who had shown any sign of disloyalty during its course.

In Angus, where traditionally Jacobite families such as Airlie and Strathmore exercised considerable influence, the Presbytery of Brechin discussed this matter on 9th April, 1746. They were deeply sensible and aggrieved that numbers of their people had had a hand in the Rebellion, some by sending out men, or giving money, or by going out themselves. The Presbytery judged all categories highly blameable, but were uncertain as to the degree of censure to be inflicted upon them, or the methods to be used to reduce them to a just sense of their duty towards their only rightful and lawful Sovereign King George, and to prevent them running into such criminal courses for the future; the matter was referred to the ensuing Synod for advice and direction.⁵¹

On 4th June, the Presbytery proceeded to carry out the recommendations of the General Assembly and instructed each minister to make particular enquiry into the behaviour of his elders, whether they had aided or assisted in promoting "that desperate cause". If a minister knew that the majority of his elders had been involved in the Rebellion he was to call together a Committee of his neighbouring ministers to assist him. They

⁵¹ Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Brechin Presbytery, Brechin, 9th April, 1746.

were to make their report to the Presbytery and seek its advice.⁵² These reports were handed in on 11th February, 1747, and approved. The conduct of the elders throughout the Presbytery was deemed to have been in no way reprehensible.⁵³

Elders were asked individually (1) If they had borne arms in the service of the Pretender? (2) If they had contributed men or money to the rebels under threat? (3) If they had said anything to encourage the Rebels or spoken against his Majesty? (4) If they had attended a non Juring Meeting House during the Rebellion?⁵⁴

Their conduct was carefully scrutinized by the Presbytery, and some elders who had given money or men in support of the Rebels only escaped censure by a majority vote. It was held that no elder was really under compulsion to contribute men, and that those who had done so should be censured. The seriousness of this offence is reflected in the case of William Balfour,⁵⁵ one of the elders in the parish of Strickathrow, who was refused baptism for his child by several ministers in the Presbytery because he had given out a man to the service of the Rebels. Balfour's plea to the Presbytery was that he had been forced to do this, and eventually the Presbytery agreed that the child could be

⁵²Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Brechin Presbytery, Brechin, 4th June, 1746.

⁵³Ibid., 11th June, 1746.

⁵⁴Stirton, Glamis, p. 102. Questions issued by the Presbytery of Forfar to be put to Kirk Sessions; Kirk Session Records, October 5th, 1746.

⁵⁵Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Brechin Presbytery, 4th June, 1746

baptized if Mr. Balfour was willing to be publicly rebuked before the congregation. Even this sentence was dissented from by some on the ground of its leniency.

On 13th June the Presbytery dealt with the Lord Justice Clerk's letter⁵⁶ asking for Lists of those who had engaged in the Rebellion either "by bearing arms or otherwise". The Presbytery decided to ask for elucidation on the meaning of the phrase "or otherwise", but professes their strongest inclinations and considered it their duty to give the Government all the assistance they could "in all necessary steps for entirely suppressing this Rebellion, and preventing the like for the future".

Presbyteries, also, enquired most carefully into the conduct of each minister during the Rebellion: "since some ministers of the Established Church are reputed to have failed in their duty in this respect".⁵⁷

In pursuance of the Synod's instructions on this point, and after due enquiry had been made, we find the ministers of the Presbyteries of Brechin and Dundee⁵⁸ making solemn declarations, one by one, that they had continued in their duty to King George, and prayed for him nominatim, and for the Royal Family, during the late Rebellion.

Only one case of a minister failing in his duty reached the

⁵⁶Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Brechin Presbytery, 13th June, 1746.

⁵⁷Ibid., 9th April, 1746.

⁵⁸Ibid., Dundee Presbytery, 30th April, 1746.

Assembly: he was Mr. Thomas Man, of Dunkeld.⁵⁹ He had failed to pray for King George nominatim, and confessed to having drunk the Pretender's health and that of his two sons. Two other charges were brought against him; of spreading false rumours about a French landing, and speaking in support of the Pretender's title to the throne. Both charges were dismissed for lack of evidence. The vote of the Assembly, by a large majority, was that Mr. Man be suspended.

The Presbytery of Dunoon, on 3rd December, 1745, dealt with the case of Mr. James Stewart, minister of Kingarth.⁶⁰ Before reading the Seasonable Warning issued by the Commission of Assembly he had read a preface to it of his own composition, which contained some unusual, if not unorthodox views on the crisis. He was suspected of having Jacobite sentiments and a complaint was lodged against him by the Laird of Hartwood. Mr. Stewart, it was alleged, had advised his parishioners not to take up arms, and to peaceably accept whatever King God should set over them. He considered that the nation was in no danger from Popery, and wondered that the ministers of Edinburgh had not preached when the Prince himself had ordered them to do so, and that he was sure he would have done so.

The Presbytery resolved to visit Kingarth and question witnesses.⁶¹ They wished to know whether Mr. Stewart had at any

⁵⁹Acts of Assembly, 1747, Index; Scots Magazine, 7th May, 1747, p. 246; Fasti, Vol. IV, p. 155.

⁶⁰Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Dunoon Presbytery, 3rd December, 1745.

⁶¹Ibid., 10th June, 1746.

time tried to instil principles of disaffection and disloyalty into his hearers; whether he had been heard to pray for the Pretender nominatim; and whether he had prayed for King George nominatim during the rebellion?

The answers given at Kingarth were such that the Presbytery resolved to suspend Mr. Stewart: his case was referred to the next meeting of the Synod, but little more is heard of it.

The Presbytery of Abertarff⁶² delayed a call to Mr. Duncan MacPherson to Laggan on suspicion of his disloyal conduct during the Rebellion. Letters, however, were sent in support of Mr. MacPherson by the Presbyteries of Abernethy and Mull,⁶³ which fully cleared his character. The Presbytery inducted him to Laggan on 16th September, 1747.

The Rev. John Grant, of Urquhart,⁶⁴ was suspected of disloyalty, taken prisoner at Inverness, and held at Tilbury. His case is fully documented in W.B. Baikie's Origins of the Forty Five. Mr. Grant denied the charges brought against him, and in his petition to the Duke of Newcastle set forth the hardships which he had suffered in a strongly Jacobite parish for his own loyalty to King George during the Rebellion. He had letters in support of his case from the Presbyteries of Abertarff and Abernethy. It has been suggested that the charges against

⁶²Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Abertarff Presbytery, 11th June, 1747.

⁶³Ibid., 18th August, 1747.

⁶⁴Baikie, Origins of the Forty Five, p. 313-329.

Mr. Grant had been instigated by Ludovic Grant for reasons of his own. No ecclesiastical action was taken against Mr. Grant. Although he was sent to Edinburgh for trial, he was allowed bail, and there the matter was allowed to rest.

One Probationer, however, a Mr. Whyte who had been on trials by the Presbytery of Deer, became a Captain in the Rebel Army. Bisset tells us that some members of the Synod of Aberdeen, when the case came before them, were of the opinion that "a rope and a tree would be his fittest reward", but in the end the Synod's decision was that he be declared incapable of licence, so that no Presbytery in the future would be able to take him on trial, and he would thus be debarred from ever becoming a minister of the Established Church.⁶⁵

What about ordinary parishioners? How did the Church deal with the normal run of her members who had been forced to take part in the Rebellion? They, too, were subjected to severe disciplinary action by the Church Courts.

The Synod of Moray, meeting at Elgin on the day after the victory at Culloden, warns its members to be very careful and cautious about attesting "any who have been openly engaged in the Rebellion or have been taken up on suspicion".⁶⁶ Ministers were instructed not to give certificates of good character to anyone who was not from their own parish. If any minister was not

⁶⁵ Miscellany of the Spalding Club, Vol. I; John Bisset's Diary,
p. 387

⁶⁶ Records, Register House, Edinburgh, Synod of Moray, Elgin,
17th April, 1746

satisfied he was not to issue such a certificate until he had consulted his neighbouring ministers, and ministers were instructed to keep copies of the certificates they issued in case they were called for. Kirk Sessions showed a similar diligence.

In the parish of Arbuthnot the Session dealt with the application of John Forbes, lately a servant at Bervio, for a token in order to come to Communion. He appeared before the Session and expressed his sorrow for having had any hand in the wicked Rebellion, but pleaded that "cunning and some force had been used to engage him in that conspiracy". His plea was accepted by the Session and he received his Communion token.⁶⁷

There appear, too, to have been instances when these certificates of good standing were obtained under false pretences. The Presbytery of Brechin was rebuked by the Synod on October, 21st, 1746, for having issued a certificate of good character to a certain Mr. Ross, who turned out to be a non Juring preacher at Lochlie, a man who had been an outlaw for many years, and was at the moment a prisoner aboard one of his Majesty's ships of war.⁶⁸

Ministers were warned again very sharply that "testimonies" must not be given to any who were suspected of having been concerned in the Rebellion.

⁶⁷ Henderson, The Kirk of St. Ternan, Arbuthnot, p. 277; Kirk Session Records, 24th July, 1748; Also Wilson, W., Airlie, p. 327 Kirk Session Records, 28th July, 1746.

⁶⁸ Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Angus and Mearns, Dundee, 21st October, 1746.

Presbyteries turned their attention also to the problem that was being raised by disaffected heritors exercising their rights in the election of a minister. The case was put that not only heritors who had taken any part in the Rebellion should be disfranchised, but all heritors who did not attend the parish Kirk but attended some non Juring meeting house, and all who were not qualified according to law, should exercise no rights in the settlement of a minister. On 23rd July, 1746, the Presbytery of Brechin considered objections of this nature raised against certain heritors who had voted in favour of Mr. Turnbull in the vacancy at Strickathrow.⁶⁹ (Stracathro). In October the case came before the Synod of Angus and Mearns who decided to enter into correspondence with other Synods and Presbyteries about "the qualifications of heritors who shall be allowed to vote for the future in the election of a minister".⁷⁰

They, also resolved to address the Assembly to prevent gentlemen who were disaffected to Church and State from interfering in the settlement of vacant parishes, and to propose that no heritor "who has not declared himself of our Communion by a constant and habitual attendance on ordinances as they are dispensed in the Church", and no one who has not qualified by having taken Oaths to the Government, shall be allowed to vote

⁶⁹Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Brechin Presbytery, 23rd July, 1746.

⁷⁰Ibid., Synod of Angus and Mearns. Dundee, 23rd October, 1746; Presbytery of Inveraray, February 24th, 1747, notes this correspondence with the Synod of Angus and Mearns but resolved that the matter should go before the Assembly before they passed judgement on it.

in the settlement of a minister.

Acting on these principles the Synod reversed the decisions of the Presbytery of Brechin in sustaining Mr. Turnbull's call to Strickathrow, and similarly reversed the decision of the Presbytery of Forfar in the settlement of Mr. William Brown as minister at Cortachy. In both cases the Presbyteries concerned appealed from the Synod to the General Assembly and had their decisions upheld.⁷¹ The Synod lost its case on technical points of law; but the issue had been raised. There was little doubt as to the mind of the Church on this subject. Any heritor who had taken part in the Rebellion, or who attended a non Juring Meeting house, or who was not qualified by Oath to the Government should be excluded from the exercise of any rights whatsoever in the election of a parish minister.

In 1748, the General Assembly passed an Act⁷² which embodied these principles, and completely disfranchised all who did not give proof positive of their loyalties to both Church and State. "The General Assembly do enact appoint and declare, that in the moderation of calls to ministers, for supplying vacant parishes, no persons shall be admitted to vote, or, if claiming a vote, shall have any regard paid to their voices, who have either twice heard sermon in any Meeting or Congregation not allowed by the laws, or

⁷¹ Acts of Assembly, 1746, Index; Scots Magazine, 7th May, 1746,
p. 246.

⁷² Ibid., 1748. Act Concerning the Qualifications of Persons
Claiming to vote in the Calling of Ministers to Vacant Parishes,
18th May.

attend Divine worship performed by any non Jurant minister or preacher professing himself to be of the Episcopal Communion, or where His Majesty King George and the Royal Family were not prayed for in express words, within 12 calendar months, immediately preceding the vacancy of the Church to be supplied, or, who during any part of the said 12 calendar months, have received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper dispensed by such ministers, or allowed their children to be baptized by any of them". By this Act it may be claimed that the influence of Jacobitism, which the Church had fought against in the parishes of Scotland ever since the Revolution, was finally brought to an end.

Disaffected schoolmasters, who had presented the Presbyteries with the need for a thorough disciplining of all within their bounds after 1715, find little place in the Presbytery Records after 1745. In the North, however, the Synod of Ross and Sutherland⁷³ and the Presbytery of Elgin⁷⁴ took steps to ensure that all their schoolmasters took the loyal Oaths and subscribed the Confession of Faith. The Synod of Glenelg had two S.P.C.K. schoolmasters who joined the rebel army. In November 1745 they were discharged from having any further concern with the Society.⁷⁵

⁷³Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Ross and Sutherland, Tain, 11th September, 1746

⁷⁴Ibid., Elgin Presbytery, 15th July and 16th December, 1746, 20th January, 1747.

⁷⁵S.P.C.K. Minutes, Register House, 28th November, 1745.

The schoolmaster at Aylth,⁷⁶ one James Warden, was accused before the Kirk Session of "sundry disloyal and illegal practises during the course of the Rebellion". He denied the charges, but was suspended from office by the Presbytery of Meigle until his case was further investigated. It dragged on until January 1750, when by a decision of the Synod of Angus and Mearns he was reinstated as schoolmaster, precentor and session clerk.

The S.P.C.K. Minutes of June 1747⁷⁷ note that with the destruction of the Mass Houses and the flight of the Romish priests and other Popish teachers after Culloden, in such places as Strathglass, Braemar, the Enzie, Glenlivet, and other places in Aberdeen and Murray, where previously bigoted Papists had refused to allow their children to attend the Society's Schools, such children were now doing so, and that some of their parents were now attending Gospel ordinances, and allowing their children to be baptized by ministers of the Established Church. They had great hopes, it was recorded, both for the spread of the Christian Reformed Religion, and that the principles of loyalty and affection to his Majesty and our happy constitution might be instilled in the minds of the rising generation.

In the North Popery is still a menace. It is regarded as "the nursery for disaffection", and "the handmaiden of rebellion". It is the constant concern of the Highland Presbyteries to root it out of their bounds. To this end the Synod of Ross and Sutherland called for lists of Papists from its Presbyteries with

⁷⁶Meikle, Aylth, p. 194-197

⁷⁷S.P.C.K. Minutes, Register House, 4th June, 1747

an account "of their behaviour during the late rebellion and since".⁷⁸

In April 1747, Mr. Chisholm of Kilmorack⁷⁹ reported that the Papists in his parish "were universally in the rebellion", but that many who had apostatized to Popery were returning again to the profession of the Protestant Religion. By next year, however, Mr. Chisholm reports that many of his so called converts from Popery have relapsed back again into their old ways. A priest has been at work in his parish who made all do public penance who had attended worship in any Protestant Church.⁸⁰ A minor revival of Roman influence takes place in Strathglass and Glenstrafarrer, and Mr. Chisholm hands in lists to the Presbytery containing the names of many "who are apostates from the Protestant religion".⁸¹ This becomes an issue of great local concern. The Sheriff of Inverness is applied to for warrants for the arrest of the two priests at work in these glens, and the whole problem of the increase of Popery in these parts is to be raised by the Commissioners to the ensuing General Assembly, with a view to being laid by the Assembly before his Majesty's Ministers of State.⁸²

⁷⁸Records, Register House, Edinburgh. Synod of Ross and Sutherland, Tain, 10th September, 1746; Also Acts of Assembly, 1747. Act for Preventing the Growth of Popery, 15th May.

⁷⁹Ibid., Dingwall, 14th April, 1747.

⁸⁰Ibid., Cromarty, 12th April, 1748.

⁸¹Ibid., Tain, 6th October, 1748.

⁸²Ibid., Dingwall, 11th April, 1749.

This, however, is an isolated occurrence. Romanism had identified itself too closely with the cause of the Pretender to allow it any popular tolerance or freedom to spread its influence.

A comparison of the Synod and Presbytery Records after the Forty Five with the similar period after the Fifteen Rebellion reveals an absolute minimum of Jacobite inspired incidents in the parishes. Apart from some minor and isolated incidents in Angus and in the North there is almost a complete absence of the tale of intrusion into pulpits, disloyal conduct by elders, lairds, beadles and people, which fill the pages of the Minute Books after 1715.

The Episcopal ministers of Edinburgh made no attempt to intrude into the City pulpits during the Prince's occupation of the City.⁸³ Perhaps, the only act of intrusion took place in Perth, when on Sunday, 8th September, Prince Charles attended St. John's Church and occupied the King's seat, and Mr. Armstrong, one of the Episcopal ministers in Perth, took the service.⁸⁴

By 1745, Episcopalian Jacobitism was no longer an effective militant force in the parishes where it had been able to impose its will twenty years before. This change in Scottish ecclesiastical life and thought was in large measure the result of the work of parish ministers, elders and schoolmasters throughout the whole of the disaffected areas north of the Tay.

⁸³ Stephen, T., History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 319
Quotes from MS Memoirs of the Episcopal Church.

⁸⁴ Farquhar, G.T.S., Episcopal History of Perth, p. 166

JACOBITE CHAPLAINS

On the outbreak of the Rebellion the Pretender's cause received very active support from the Roman Catholic priesthood.⁸⁵ Bishop Hugh McDonald of Morar, since 1732 Roman Catholic Bishop in the Highlands, blessed the Prince's standard at Glenfinnan. Father Allan Macdonald of Clanranald's Regiment rode up and down the line and blessed the troops before they went into action at Falkirk. Priests followed their clansmen into the field and accompanied the Highland army throughout the campaign. Father Allan Macdonald sharing the Prince's life as a fugitive for several months. The faithfulness of the Roman priests in the discharge of their duty towards their flock is indicated by the number taken prisoner. The names of 15 Priests are to be found in the List of Prisoners. Some died during captivity. The two Jesuits among them were banished. Those who survived captivity were eventually released. Bishop MacDonald had to leave the country for some time, but returned in 1746 in disguise as a Mr. Brown. He was allowed to live in the Highlands on a kind of parole until his death in 1773.

The best known of the Episcopal clergymen to go into the field with the Rebel Army was the Rev. Robert Lyon of Perth.⁸⁶

⁸⁵For Roman Catholic background see - Bellesheim, Vol. IV, p. 189-200; Baikie, Origins of the Forty Five, p. 454-5; The Lyon in Mourning, Vol. III, p. 50-57; Prisoners of the Forty Five, p. 69; The Jacobite Prisoners, p. 221.

⁸⁶Lyon in Mourning, Vol. I, p. 355; Farquhar, W., History of Perth, chapters XVII and XIX deal fully with Rev. Robert Lyon; Chambers, History of the Rebellion, p. 464 onwards.

He served as Chaplain to Lord Ogilvy's Regiment. Taken prisoner at Carlisle, he was tried and executed at Penrith. Robert Lyon became a martyr for his Jacobitism. He left behind him letters which provide a full record and defence of his militant Jacobite faith. His view of the Revolution Convention, for instance, was that they had acted as traitors to their country, and as rebels to their King. "For rational and solid arguments", he says, he embraced "the doctrine of passive obedience, the divine right of kings, and in particular the indefeasible and hereditary right of our gracious sovereign, King James 8th and 3rd". "As our then injured King", he continues, "and his undoubted heirs have from time to time uninterruptedly claimed their right and asserted their dominion, I am so far from thinking, that the royal misfortunes loose the subjects from their obedience, that I rather apprehend that they loudly call for a steadier allegiance and more faithful duty".⁸⁷ His last letter sets out his convictions about the nature of his own Church, "in which I have the honour to die a very unworthy priest". "It is a Church national and independent of any other, and every power on earth, happily governed by her own truly primitive Bishops, as so many spiritual princes presiding in their different Districts, and in them accountable to none but God for the administration of her discipline; a Church whose Creeds demonstrate her soundness in the Faith, and blest with a Liturgy (I mean the Scots Liturgy) compiled by her own Bishops, nigher to the primitive model than any other Church this day can boast of".

⁸⁷ Farquhar, History of Perth, p. 162

He ends his letter on a clarion note of utter certainty:
 "I heartily thank God's holy providence for vouchsafing me the honour and felicity of dying for the sake of conscience, and sealing with my blood those heavenly truths I have mentioned, particularly that of loyalty to my King and Prince. And I do declare upon this awful and solemn occasion, I feel no sting of conscience for the part I have acted in our civil discord, and so sincerely profess before God and the world that, had he of his infinite wisdom thought proper to prolong my life, I should ever, by His all powerful aid and grace, steadily have persisted in the same faith and principles in the hearty and zealous belief and open profession of which I now die".⁸⁸

Robert Lyon was the only Scottish Episcopal minister to pay with his life for this passionate Jacobite faith. We may assume, however, that his beliefs represent the convictions of many of his colleagues, who were prepared to face imprisonment, persecution or penury in the same indomitable conviction. Officially the Episcopal Church may never have declared itself for the Pretender, but there is no doubt, from the actions of men like Robert Lyon, where the loyalties of Episcopalians lay.

"The Prisoners of the Forty Five" lists the Episcopalian ministers who were taken during the Rebellion, and the "Lyon in Mourning" and Bishop Forbes Journal gives a great deal of information about those who were subsequently put in prison or

⁸⁸Farquhar, History of Perth, p. 183

who went into hiding.⁸⁹ John MacLauchlan, who had followed the Rebel army throughout the campaign, and claimed to hold the Prince's Commission as "Chaplain General to the loyal clans"⁹⁰ was obliged to run to Lochbroom after Culloden and skulk there for several months before he thought it safe to return to Dingwall. John Maitland, chaplain to the 2nd Angus Regiment,⁹¹ at one time Episcopal minister at Careston, fled the country after Culloden, and lived as an exile at Dunkirk, only returning to Edinburgh as an old man. Mr. William Harper, of Bothkenner, later to become minister of Old St. Pauls, Edinburgh, is mentioned in Lord Roseberry's "Persons Concerned in the Rebellion" as being "very active in assisting the rebels, and waiting on the Pretender's son at Falkirk".⁹²

Among those taken prisoner before the campaign had properly begun was Robert Forbes,⁹³ then Episcopal minister at Leith, later to become the great collector of Jacobite relics and the compiler of "The Lyon in Mourning". He hurried, with three other ministers from Edinburgh, to join the Prince's army, only to be taken prisoner at Stirling.⁹⁴

⁸⁹Prisoners of the Forty Five, SHS, Vol. I, p. 221; Lyon In Mourning, Vol. III, p. 23;

⁹⁰Craven, Bishop Forbes Journal, p. 124-5
1745-46

⁹¹Mackintosh, Alex, Lord Ogilvy's Regt., /SHS, p. 8; Bishop Forbes Journal, p. 182

⁹²Ingram, A Jacobite Stronghold of the Church, p. 66

⁹³Journal of Bishop Forbes, p. 12-13.

⁹⁴Scots Magazine, 1745, p. 399

Five months later they were released from Stirling Castle on the orders of the Duke of Cumberland to be removed to Edinburgh. While waiting in the street they were seen by Lord Albemarle, who asked why they were not roped. He was told that they were "Gentlemen". "Gentlemen", said Albemarle, "Damn them for rebels", and he ordered them to be roped for the march to Edinburgh.⁹⁵

Before the days of romantic Jacobitism this, undoubtedly, was the view taken of Jacobite Episcopal ministers who embroiled themselves in a rebellion against the King and Government.

THE ALBEMARLE PAPERS

In November, 1746, the Earl of Albemarle⁹⁶ forwarded to the Duke of Newcastle an Anonymous Memorial, supposed to have been written by Campbell of Stonefield, Sheriff Depute of Argyleshire, which he regarded as being worthy of the Government's serious consideration.⁹⁷ It deals with many urgent Highland problems that do not fall within the scope of this study, but it has a great deal to say about many of the ecclesiastical problems with which we are already familiar. It cites Popish priests⁹⁸ as the main

⁹⁵Ingram, Jacobite Stronghold of the Church, p. 43

⁹⁶The Albemarle Papers: Being the Correspondence of William Anne, Second Earl of Albemarle, Commander in Chief in Scotland, 1746-1747. With an Appendix of Letters from Andrew Fletcher, Lord Justice Clerk to the Duke of Newcastle, 1746-1748. New Spalding Club.

⁹⁷Ibid., Preface, p. LXXI.

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 306, Para. 5

agents in the spread of Jacobite doctrines, especially the doctrine of hereditary indefeasible right. It deprecates the great extent of the Highland parishes,⁹⁹ in which there may be as many as five separate places of worship, all under one minister. The inevitable result is that many do not hear a sermon more than four times a year.

It condemns the low stipends paid in Highland parishes. Many a minister, after struggling against insuperable difficulties for years, leaves for the Lowlands, and the Highlands are left with "weak men", who are quite unable to "wrest the people" out of the hands of the Chiefs.¹⁰⁰

To meet this urgent crisis in Highland life the author of the Memorial has several positive recommendations to make. All Popish priests should be ordered to leave the British Isles by a fixed date.¹⁰¹ After that time it should be an offence for any to harbour or conceal them. He would like to see a considerable reduction in the size of Highland parishes, to not more than 8 miles Scots in extent, with the Church in the middle of the parish, and with at least 3 schools distributed strategically throughout the parish, with a salary for the schoolmasters of not less than £10 per annum sterling. People would then be able to attend sermon every Lord's Day, and "no place would breed up wild men, strangers to religion and society, for all would be instructed in the principles of religion, loyalty and virtue".¹⁰²

⁹⁹Albemarle Papers, p. 306, Para, 7.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 306, Para. 8.

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 308, Para. 7.

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 308, Paras. 8 and 9.

He wished to see all Papists instructed by Protestant ministers. If they are unwilling to accept this, he suggests that they should be given no leases, and if they do not come to Church within three years they are to be obliged to leave the Kingdom.¹⁰³

Attendance of children at school should come under stricter supervision. To achieve this lists of children who did not attend, and the reasons why their parents neglected this duty, were to be sent to the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge. "King's bursars", and "bursars from other funds", should be made available to assist in sending suitable Highland students to the Universities.¹⁰⁴ By such changes in Highland life it was hoped that in a generation or so "the Highland tongue would wear out", and the inhabitants of the Highlands cease to be "barbarians to the rest of Britain".¹⁰⁵ The thousand pounds granted annually by the King would be quite insufficient by itself to finance these new ventures. A new Fund would have to be set up, subscriptions to it should be sought from all over the United Kingdom, and a Committee set up to administer its affairs, consisting of ministers and merchants nominated by the Lord Justice Clerk. Pending the establishment of such a Committee it was recommended that three ministers be settled at or near Inverness, Inveraray and Dunkeld, and, possibly a fourth at Aberdeen or Strathbogie, whose duty it

¹⁰³ Albemarle Papers, p. 308, Para. 11.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 308, para. 12.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 308, Para. 15.

would be to make monthly or more frequent reports to the Lord Justice Clerk about the disposition of the inhabitants in their districts and the movements of Jacobite agents.¹⁰⁶

The Albemarle Papers contain a no less interesting Appendix of Letters sent by the Lord Justice Clerk, Andrew Fletcher, to the Duke of Newcastle, between 1746 and 1748. The Lord Justice Clerk's letters are concerned chiefly with the application of the Act of 1746 as it related to the Episcopalians, the shutting up of Meeting Houses in Edinburgh, Kincardineshire, Perth and Aberdeen, and the resulting prosecution of Episcopalian ministers.¹⁰⁷ The preamble to the Act sets forth very clearly the Government's view of the Episcopalians and their responsibility for the Rebellion.

The Episcopalian ministers it said "have never taken the oaths to his Majesty or to his Royal Father, or ever did in express words during the exercise of Divine worship pray for his Majesty and the Royal Family. By means whereof these illegal meetings have greatly contributed to excite and foment a spirit of disaffection among numbers of persons in that part of the Kingdom against his Majesty's person and government, which hath been one cause of the wicked and unnatural Rebellion lately raised and carried on against his Majesty in favour of a Popish Pretender".

¹⁰⁶Albemarle Papers, Preface, p. LXX

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 464-523; Scots Magazine, Vol. VIII, p. 364. An Act more effectually to prohibit and prevent pastors and ministers from officiating in Episcopal Meeting Houses in Scotland, without duly qualifying themselves according to law; Also Albemarle Papers, Preface, LXXIV-LXXV; Albemarle Papers, p. 427. Edinburgh had 17 Meeting Houses and 15 Episcopal ministers, p. 497. Situation in Perth, p. 517. Aberdeenshire p. 520-523. Kincardineshire.

The Act, therefore, directed that on or before November 1st, 1746, the Sheriffs and Magistrates should complete Lists of all Episcopal Meeting Houses within their bounds, and that on or before September 1st, 1746, every minister of an Episcopal congregation in Scotland should produce to the proper authority a certificate of his having taken the oath of Allegiance to the reigning Sovereign. After 1st November, 1746, the authorities were empowered to close all Meeting Houses where ministers had not complied with the Act.

As to Episcopal ministers who entered upon their office after September, 1st, 1746, the Act made an alteration in their qualifications as defined in the Act of Toleration of Queen Anne. Such ministers were required to produce and to register their letters of orders as before, but their orders would not be deemed valid unless they had been given by a Bishop of the Church of England or of Ireland. Ordination at the hands of a Scottish bishop was not to be accepted as a legal qualification for ministering to an Episcopalian congregation in Scotland.

The Act, also, laid down that not more than 4 persons besides those of the household were allowed to assemble for worship. Fines and imprisonment awaited those who attended unregistered Meeting Houses where the King was not prayed for. No Peer was capable of election as a Representative Peer who had been present at an unauthorized Meeting during the preceding year. Nor under such circumstances could a person become a Member of Parliament, a Magistrate, or a Dean of Crafts. Inshort, public life was barred to Episcopals who refused to qualify to the Government. Only five Episcopal ministers were prepared to qualify in terms of the

1746 Act. They were Mr. Walker, of Old Meldrum, Mr. Laing, of Puttachie, Mr. Livingston, of Old Deer, Mr. Skinner, of Longside, and Mr. Farquhar, of Dumfries.¹⁰⁸

The Church made clear its attitude towards the 1746 Act by the action it took with these ministers. It regarded their compliance as "an offence against God and the Church which could only be purged by repentance and priestly absolution". Compliance was sin. Mr. Skinner and Mr. Livingston, therefore, submitted to the discipline of their Bishop, Bishop Gerard, and were absolved.¹⁰⁹

Walker, in his "Life of Bishop Jolly" says about the Penal laws: "It was at their religion that the Government in its acts of repression chiefly struck, evidently regarding their religion as the root of their disaffection".¹¹⁰ By "their religion" Walker appears to mean "apostolic order" and "liturgical worship". In these principles as such he sees no seeds of disaffection. But much more was included in "their religion" than these two cardinal doctrines. Since the Revolution there had been included in "their religion" as an article of faith, belief in the divine indefeasible hereditary right of monarchy. Robert Lyon the martyr died for this faith. Bishop Gerard enforced his spiritual discipline over his erring compliant presbyters in this faith.

¹⁰⁸ Scots Magazine, Vol. VIII, p. 364

¹⁰⁹ Miscellany of Spalding Club, Vol. II, p. 22. Register of St. Paul's Chapel, Aberdeen; Walker, W., Life of John Skinner of Linshart, p. 50; Stephen, T. History of Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 326.

¹¹⁰ Walker, W., Life of Bishop Jolly, Introduction, p. 9

Walker's assessment of the situation is not supported by the historical facts. The Government was not Presbyterian, using Jacobitism as a bludgeon to exterminate Episcopalianism in Scotland. Nor was it held from a realistic appreciation of the situation which confronted it in Scotland through the Episcopalianism of the Scottish insurgents. The Government was right in assuming that their religion was the root of their disaffection.

The Government was not, however, satisfied with the Act of 1746 and passed a more stringent Act in 1748.¹¹¹ By this Act the registration of orders from a Scottish bishop, although already made, was declared null and void after 29th September. The Bill was opposed by several of the English Bishops in the House of Lords on the grounds that it was too harsh, and would lead virtually to the extinction of the Scottish Episcopate. Yet even those who sought to ameliorate in some way the lot of their fellow Episcopalians in Scotland were not blind to their declared Jacobitism.

Dr. Sherlock, Bishop of Salisbury,¹¹² agreed that the Non juring ministers had contributed to the encouragement of the late Rebellion in Scotland, but pleaded that they had suffered enough for it, and that attempts should now be made to win them over to the side of the Government by "mild usage". "The more of them we gain over, the more strength we shall add to our present happy establishment", he argued, "and the more we shall weaken the cause

¹¹¹Parliamentary History, Vol. XIV, p. 269-315; Grub, Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 40.

¹¹²Scots Magazine, Vol. X, p. 589-596

of the Pretender".

While the view of Dr. Sæcker, Bishop of Oxford,¹¹³ later Archbishop of Canterbury, was expressed thus:- "The Episcopal party in Scotland have as much "right" and "power" to confer orders as the primitive Christians had before their religion came to be the established religion in any country, and if they would profess and practise the same submission to the civil government I should think them equally intitled to protection and indulgence".

The 1748 Act made more explicit certain prohibitions in the 1746 Act relating to Chaplains employed in private houses. Under the 1746 Act no person could be so employed unless they had taken the oaths prescribed by law. The 1748 Act declared however that "from and after the 29th September 1748 any person being or pretending to be in holy orders, of any denomination whatsoever, other than ministers, elders or preachers of the established Church of Scotland, who should preach or perform any divine service in any house or family of which he was not the master, in the presence or hearing of any other person or persons, whether such persons were of the family or not, should be deemed to be one who exercised the employment, service, and function of a Chaplain, within the provision and the true intent and meaning of the same Act".¹¹⁴

¹¹³Scots Magazine, 1748, p. 589-590.

¹¹⁴Grub, Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, Vol. IV, p.40

The force of this Act was that it prohibited Episcopal ministers from functioning except in their own houses. Under the 1746 Act an Episcopal minister could minister in any house to the numbers laid down by the Act, the family plus four. Under the 1748 Act he could only minister in his own house to groups of four.

Since, however, there is no law made which has no loopholes, by various devices a way round these restrictions was sought, and in some measure the ministry of the strict Non Jurors to their people carried on. Houses were divided into compartments, or holes were bored in the walls of rooms, and the service taken on the landing, so that the maximum number allowed by law might hear. Divine service might be read sixteen times a day in this way.¹¹⁵ Baptisms or marriages or ordinations were carried out in secret with only the minimum number of persons present. Letters and Registers of the time show the place as - "under a tree in Lord Rollo's park"¹¹⁶; "in the back stair"; "in my closet"; "near the cross".¹¹⁷

Bishop Gleig of Brechin says of the effects of the Penal Acts: "That the framers of the law enacted in 1748 meant well, I shall not controvert; but the consequences of that law have not been beneficial. It was, no doubt, intended to crush disaffection

¹¹⁵Blatch, Memoir of Bishop Low, p. 55

¹¹⁶Jolly Kist MSS, No. 643. Letter from W. Erskyne, Muthil, 11.4.1750.

¹¹⁷A Jacobite Stronghold of the Church. Baptismal Register of Old St. Pauls, p. 61.

to the Government, but I know of nothing which it has really crushed but religion".¹¹⁸

In fact the Penal laws crushed disaffection. People could worship at the Parish Church if they felt free in conscience to do so. If their principles would not allow them to do this then they could worship at a Qualified English Chapel. Here the Liturgy of the Church of England was in use, and here, of course, the minister would be in English orders. By these means they would have shown their good affection to the Government. If they chose not to avail themselves of these remedies, and continued to support Non Jurancy, then, their action was judged for what it was intended to be, an act of disaffection.

MORE JOLLY KIST LETTERS

These issues are all reflected in the letters to Bishop Alexander contained in the Jolly Kist. The terms of the 1746 Act, for instance, were of considerable interest to the local non juring ministers.

Mr. Niving, of Torbex, near Stirling had his Meeting House closed down in June 1746. In October, he writes to Bishop Alexander, who had recently returned from Edinburgh, asking for a legal definition of the word "household" as used in the 1746 Act.¹¹⁹ Does it "comprehend strangers, as well as the master and mistress,

¹¹⁸ Walker, W. Memoir of Bishop Gleig of Brechin, p. 193

¹¹⁹ Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh. No. 499. Letter from N. Niving, 21.10.1745.

children and servants, which make up a family in its common acceptance?" A great deal depended on how strictly or how leniently the word household was defined.

At the end of 1746, Mr. Sterling writes from Perth giving some indication of the difficulties there in maintaining regular worship under the restrictions imposed by the Act, and also indicating the rise in the numbers attending the Qualified Meeting House.

"Mr. Innes is this day at Ballgowan, he officiates there, conforme to the last Act (1746 Act), its a great blessing to have a clergyman among us, we must be content tho' we can't have the prayers so regular. I was at Nairne where I heard prayers from Mr. Cheyne. Mr. Abernethie went this morning to Logie, to read prayers for his congregation there, that poor gentlemen he reads prayers for most part every Lord's Day, 6 or 7 times, and at some distance which is a great fatigue Our congregation are much diminished, some gone to the Qualified Meeting, (I mean the Chaplain to the Regiments) and others to the Kirk, but none of any note, that heard Mr. Lyon".¹²⁰

In June next year there is a letter to the Bishop from Mr. Robertson, at Edradynate, recounting his difficulties. He assures the Bishop that he is doing all he can in these calamitous times, but is greatly discouraged by certain gentlemen "of the first rate here" who "at the first blast" have fallen away and

120

Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 504. Letter from G. Sterling, Perth, 7.12.1746.

joined the schismatical party (Qualified Meeting). Free movement along the public roads appears to have been uncertain. Robertson tells the Bishop that while Mr. Duncan Cameron travels regularly to his part of the country from Braes of Rannoch "baptizing and marrying as occasion serves", he would have "paid the Bishop a visit ere now" but cannot for he cannot "safely travel the public road".¹²¹

There is an interesting reference to the activities of Mr. Cameron in the "Forfeited Estate Papers". The Factor for the Estate of Strowan and its neighbourhood reports that there are no Non Jurant clergymen of meeting houses in his area "except one Cameron, who stays with Mr. Stewart at Kynachen, near Tummel Bridge, and preaches in the ordinary way, viz., he has only 4 people in the room, but perhaps a numerous audience without. He likewise baptizes children, but Mr. Small (the local factor) has not heard that any of the King's tenants have employed him this way".¹²²

Difficult as it had been to maintain financially the Bishops and clergy before the Rebellion, after 1746 they found themselves in such straitened circumstances that an Appeal was made, "seeking the assistance of charitable persons" and setting up a Relief Fund.¹²³ Bishop Keith's letters to Alexander make it plain that he at least was not hopeful of much response from the

¹²¹Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, No. 537, Letter from G. Robertson, Edradynate, 11.6.1747.

¹²²Miller, Forfeited Estates Papers, p. 215-6; Stewart, A Highland Parish, p. 215.

¹²³Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 509. Appeal by Bishop Keith and Bishop Alexander, 1.1.1747.

various Districts, since they all found it a hard enough struggle "to support their respective clergymen".¹²⁴ The penury in which men like Keith found themselves is reflected in this pathetic little sentence from a letter to Alexander: "Can you send me a pair of old shoes? I would wear them at home, because my corry toes pinch me vastly, and your foot is a size or two larger than mine".¹²⁵

Again, the letters tell of the steps taken by local authorities to enforce the Penal Acts. Mr. Ramsay,¹²⁶ writing from Memus, in Angus, informs the Bishop that they are all more on their guard than formerly since they have all received letters from the Sheriff warning them that the Government "will not have their laws eluded, or the design of them defeat, and presumes we have all been so prudent, as keep within the bounds prescribed by law".

He thinks that the Sheriff's letters have been put out at the instigation of the Presbytery of Forfar, and wonders if this action by the Presbytery is general throughout the Kingdom. He, too, is having difficulty with his leading families. The penalties in the 1746 Act have resulted, obviously, in a diminished enthusiasm for the Non Jurant Meeting Houses. "My Lady Airly", he writes, "has not yet appeared, it seems her fears are not over".

Death also removed some of their most loyal supporters, Mr.

¹²⁴ Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 510. Letter from Bishop Keith, 29.1.1747.

¹²⁵ Ibid., No. 550. Letter from Bishop Keith, 20.8.1747.

¹²⁶ Ibid., No. 561. Letter from John Ramsay, Memus, 5.11.1747.

Abernethie,¹²⁷ pays high tribute to the late Lady Nairne: "She was honest in the worst of times, and dared to support the sinking cause of truth and virtue amidst the greatest danger. The Christian priesthood she esteemed and honoured she was as dutiful to the Church, as loyal to the Crown, and I'm afraid has left few of her own rank that can be compared to her".

The letters between Bishop Alexander and his friends were carried mostly by couriers. "This comes by Lady Kincardine's servant going to Tullibodie", writes Mr. Livingston¹²⁸ from Dunfermline, and suggests it would be an advantage if the Bishop could send a letter back by the same carrier.

Mr. Robert Lyon, of Stretton (England) writes regularly to the Bishop about theological and domestic matters, but is careful to keep out of his correspondence any criticisms of the Government or its policies. There is rumour that letters between Scotland and England from known Jacobites to their friends are being tampered with. "Many I find suspect that all letters are opened and read in Post Offices, and I cannot affirm that none are", writes Robert Lyon, "but as far as I have been able to observe every letter to and from myself that was entered into any office has been duly forwarded". In a letter two months later he writes wryly: "A fine corkscrew in a canny hand can open a bottle and taste your liquor without you perceiving it, thereupon be not over confident in getting any unbroached".¹²⁹

¹²⁷ Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 566. Letter from W. Abernethie, Logie Almond, 23.11.1747.

¹²⁸ Ibid., No. 564. Letter from A. Livingston, Dunfermline, 17.11.1747.

¹²⁹ Ibid., No. 563. Letter from R. Lyon, Stretton, 14.8.1746.

Bishop Keith warns Alexander in a letter 18th November, 1747 that "our Meetings are to be strictly eyed" and that the Duke of Newcastle has sent a letter to the Lord Justice Clerk ordering the Sheriffs to search for rebels even in the houses of those who are friends of the Government; "accordingly Lord Braco's house was most strictly searched, but nothing found".¹³⁰

The effects of the more stringent restrictions contained in the 1748 Act are discussed in the letters. Mr. Ramsay, of Memus, writes in June 1748:¹³¹ "Im afraid it will be very hard on several of us, particularly myself with regard to Kirriemuir, unless some shift be fallen on for me to take a room in Kirriemuir and pay rent, then I think I may properly be said to be master of it". "Last Sunday I gave worship at Glen Prosin, to all I was able to take in, which is the first they have got for nearly three years, and I propose to celebrate the Holy Eucharist there on Sunday come fortnight; this new Act will be hardest on these poor people at such a distance".

Bishop Falconer writes a letter in November 1748 from Elgin, describing the terrible straits into which the Non Jurant cause in that part of Murray had fallen.¹³² He writes to thank Alexander for the sum of £30 which is to be sent on to him, most of which has come from the Laird of Balgowan's legacy. "I have been

¹³⁰ Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 565. Letter from Bishop Keith, 18.11.1747.

¹³¹ Ibid., No. 584. Letter from J. Ramsay, Memus, 30.6.1748.

¹³² Ibid., No. 598. Letter from Bishop Falconer, Elgin, 29.11.1748.

obliged to borrow a little money upon the credit of this legacy", he says, "I cannot live in this poor place. Many of the most considerable of my people here wrote to London for a qualified clergyman, and they are resolved to have one at any rate. They don't mind how I live, whether I have or want, 'tis all the same to them". There is a sad note of despair in Falconer's letter, as if he feels that all he has stood for has been swept away, he has been deserted by his former friends; and he can go on fighting no longer. "Why then should I lose my labour and any small matter of money in this place, I rather chuse if I can find credit for it to turn farmer and retire to the country. God help us, we are in very dismal circumstances, our poor Church is utterly crushed, and many of those who formerly were members have cut themselves off and turned their backs upon their pastors".

An equally dismal account of the situation in Struan country is given by Mr. Cameron,¹³³ of Kynachen, in a letter, 7th March, 1749. He, too, was a beneficiary under the Balgowan legacy. In his letter he informs the Bishop that his total income "since I had 4 guineas at your hand at Edinburgh the famous year '45" has been £16-15/-. He has only received "one year's satisfaction" at Kynachen, and tells of the risks he has run to carry on his ministry since he has no house of his own. As much as he can he tries to keep within the law, but he regrets to report that "most of the commons go to the Kirk with their children, and we cannot

¹³³Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 604. Letter from D. Cameron, Kynachan, 7.3.1749.

make an bold attempt to prevent it, we are glad to be quiet with serving some gentlemen, and this is all we can say of our situation".

Mr. Forbes,¹³⁴ of Leith, writes in February, 1750, to ask if Bishop Alexander knows of a suitable family for a Mr. MacKenzie who had been a tutor with Highland families for the past six or seven years, but because of the late Act (1748) thought it proper to give up rather than comply. Forbes thinks that a family who might be willing to employ MacKenzie "as a factor" would be suitable, "that so under colour of that, he might still go on in his old way".

In March, 1750, Mr. Ramsay¹³⁵ writes from Memus: "We have all taken a great deal of freedom, and except for the people of Glen Prosin, most of my small flock are pretty well accomodate with worship". While this is encouraging news, his chief family, the Airlies, continue to show little enthusiasm for non jurant worship. "Lady Airly", he writes, "had the courage to come one Sunday here to Prayers, since which time the family have been at Auchterhouse: I have made them several visits this winter, but my Lady seems timerous to have worship in her own family, however I always take the liberty in the young Lady's room; I let my Lady know of the five guineas you got for me at Cortachie, but (except 20 shillings)

¹³⁴Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 631. Letter from R. Forbes, Leith, 27.2.1750.

¹³⁵Ibid., No. 632. Letter from J. Ramsay, Memus, 16.3.1750.

have got none since".¹³⁶

At the end of 1750, Mr. Innes¹³⁷ wrote from Perth that they had got a qualified man there, and that he would be sure to try and influence the people at Nairne and Dunkeld. "I am afraid," he says, "some of them are wavering already and have the more need of a proper person to steady them". Next month he reports that his fears have been confirmed; "My neighbour has been at Dunkeld and I'm afraid he has had too much good success".¹³⁸

His qualified neighbour causes Mr. Innes endless trouble.¹³⁹ He threatens his people with the law. He tries to make it so difficult for Mr. Innes to work in Perth that he will leave the town. "If I keep to the legal numbers", he writes "I am sure most of my people will leave me, if I exceed I must go to prison, hard dilemma, both horns wound".¹⁴⁰

In September, 1752, Mr. Seton¹⁴¹ writes from Forfar that the

¹³⁶Inglis, Achterhouse, An Angus Parish, p. 134. There is this interesting entry in the Parish Records. David Ogilvy of Airly, only son of David, Lord Ogilvy, was born at Achterhouse, 4th December, 1751, and baptised by the Parish Minister, 6th December, 1751, "in the presence of certain persons of distinction". Lord and Lady Ogilvy were at this time outlaws and supposed to be refugees in France. Lady Ogilvy must have been smuggled secretly into Scotland for the birth of this little boy. Apart from this entry in the Baptismal Register their secret seems to have been well kept.

¹³⁷Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 694. Letter from G. Innes, Perth, 9.11.1750.

¹³⁸Ibid., No. 706. Letter from G. Innes, Perth, 31.12.1750.

¹³⁹Ibid., No. 773. Letter from G. Innes, Perth, 20.7.1752.

¹⁴⁰Ibid., No. 778. Letter from G. Innes, Perth, 11.8.1752.

¹⁴¹Ibid., No. 780. Letter from W. Seton, Forfar, 16.9.1752.

Sheriff there has orders to inspect their conduct "narrowly", and has been advised by friends to discharge his congregation from meeting in such numbers as formerly. He has resolved, he says, to act "with wary reserve" since there is a party of military in the town, but he is afraid that he might be the first they take action against. Mr. Walker's house at Kirriemuir has been twice searched by the military, he reports, and he has been made to conform to the law. He proposes that he may be put in priests orders in order to enable him to serve his congregation in person, "as he can have no clergyman at this ticklish juncture to officiate for him".

Several letters make reference to the banishment of Mr. Conacher.¹⁴² Conacher had worked between Doune and the Braes of Lochaber.¹⁴³ He was tried at Inveraray and received sentence of perpetual banishment from Scotland for having celebrated marriages contrary to a statute of Charles II's reign. Mr. Niving¹⁴⁴ suggests in one of his letters that the real reason for Conacher's arrest was that he was "preaching rebellion". This may well have been the case. It is certain from the Intelligence Reports in the "Albemarle Papers"¹⁴⁵ that Conacher had been watched by the authorities since 1746.

¹⁴²Scots Magazine, Vol. XVII, p. 207-209, 313, 316; Arnots Criminal Trials, p. 339-343.

¹⁴³Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 635. Letter from J. Conacher, Gartlach, 23.3.1750.

¹⁴⁴*Ibid.*, No. 892. Letter from N. Niving, Torbex, 30.1.1755.

¹⁴⁵Albemarle Papers, Enclosure II, Intelligence, p. 374.

Mr. Erskyne, of Muthil,¹⁴⁶ says about the affair: "Mr. Conacher's fate gives us very much concern, as it does likewise to think what will become of his numerous and dispersed congregation, no one man in Scotland could supply his place, and I'm afraid there will be found great difficulty to get any" and adds, "which was no doubt foreseen by his persecutors, and would be a motive with them for treating him as they have done".

The Statute of Charles II's reign was certainly not designed to deal with the kind of offence Conacher had committed, but under it he could be banished from Scotland. It is not hard to believe that the authorities had simply found a technical charge that would remove Mr. Conacher from his seditious occupations amid the "Highland hills and Lochaber Braes" for some considerable time. Conacher's fate, however, had other effects, which, no doubt, had been anticipated also by the authorities. It dampened down the enthusiasm of young men who had thoughts of becoming candidates for the Non Juring Episcopal ministry.

Mr. Guthrie,¹⁴⁷ of Restennet, had hoped that he might be able to persuade Mr. Alex. Smith, AM, tutor in the Laird of Laton's family to enter the ministry. He wrote, however, to Bishop Alexander in June, 1755: "Last time I saw him he seemed shy to enter upon the subject; the severe sentence against poor Mr. Conacher, probably had dampened his courage".

¹⁴⁶Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 907, Letter from W. Erskyne, Muthil, 23.5.1755.

¹⁴⁷Ibid., No. 903, Letter from D. Guthrie, Restennet, 9.6.1755, and No. 923. Letter from W. Walker, 26.9.1755.

At the end of 1756, ten years after Culloden, Mr. Innes¹⁴⁸ in Perth is still troubled by soldiers attending his Meetings in disguise to see if he is breaking the law. Some are supposed to have attended disguised in women's clothes. This Mr. Innes himself suspects, but the result has been to frighten away almost his entire congregation, which largely consisted of women. His income is reduced to 2 or 3 shillings a week at most, and he doubts how much longer he will be able financially to maintain himself. His house rent is high, he receives little support from "the gentlemen", and suspects that he never will.

There is, of course, in these letters no discussion of Jacobitism as such. These are not seditious, nor are they treasonable letters. There is no attempt being made to stir up a third Rebellion: but there is constant reference to Jacobite news which show the convictions of both writer and recipient. Bishop Keith's¹⁴⁹ letters contain news of leading Jacobite laity hunted after the Forty Five. He wonders what has happened, for instance, to Lord Pitsligo - "Poor worthy Lord Pitsligo!" He writes to Alexander about the arrival in Edinburgh of Dr. Cameron's lady from Dunkirk,¹⁵⁰ and of her questioning at the hands of the Lord Justice Clerk.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁸Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 986. Letter from G. Innes, Perth, 17.12.1756.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., No. 565. Letter from Bishop Keith, 18.11.1747 and No. 714. Letter dated 7.2.1751: For Lord Pitsligo see The Book of Buchan, Tocher, p. 167.

¹⁵⁰Ibid., No. 756. Letter from Bishop Keith, 10.10.1751.

¹⁵¹Ibid., No. 757. Letter from Bishop Keith, 17.10.1751.

He writes to tell that the late Lochiel's brother and two gentlemen of the same name have arrived in Edinburgh "to be examined, but we know not yet upon what points".¹⁵² He also passes on to Alexander news he has had from the French Court, which he has received in a "private letter from Paris".¹⁵³

In December, 1752, there is rumour in Scotland about the probable conversion from Popery of Prince Charles, and Alexander is asked by Dr. Garloch in Edinburgh - "Pray is it true you've got a Convert over the water?"¹⁵⁴

In April, 1753, there is a letter from Robert Lyon at Stretton sending news back to Scotland about Dr. Cameron's arrival in London.¹⁵⁵ "If the person brought lately from Edinburgh, now in the Tower of London, can be proved to be Dr. Archibald Cameron brother to the late Lochiel, and to have been trafficking about a new Insurrection (both which he denies) he will be hanged".

In June, Forbes¹⁵⁶ writes to Alexander giving the news of Dr. Cameron's execution: "Poor Dr. Cameron! I believe I should say, happy Dr. Cameron! - for never did Man make a more glorious exit. He met the last great enemy with as much

¹⁵² Jolly Kist MSS, Episcopal College, Edinburgh, No. 758. Letter from Bishop Keith, 24.10.1751.

¹⁵³ Ibid., No. 767. Letter from Bishop Keith, 26.12.1751

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., No. 786. Letter from Dr. Garloch, 21.12.1752.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., No. 810. Letter from R. Lyon, Stretton, 26.4.1753.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., No. 819. Letter from R. Forbes, 21.6.1753.

interpidity, and as much decency, as even the great Balmerino".¹⁵⁷ It was Forbe's view that the death of Dr. Cameron did nothing but hurt to the Government's cause. Certainly there was a great deal of popular clamour to save Dr. Cameron's life. Perhaps the Government had little to fear any more from Scottish Jacobitism and could have been generous over Dr. Cameron's disaffection. He died, however, a martyr for his faith. His dying was a last, defiant gesture of contempt for all who had turned against the King and the King's son, and who had thus put themselves against the Divine ordering of God. "As to my religion, I thank God I die a member (tho' unworthy) of that Church in whose communion I have always lived, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, as by law established before the most unnatural Revolution in 1688".¹⁵⁸ He sent to his son, as a last gift, a pair of steel shoe buckles, with these words:- "I send him these and not my silver ones, and if I had gold I would not send him the gold, but these steel ones which I wore when skulking with the Prince. For as steel is hard and of small value, it is therefore an emblem of constancy and disinterestedness. So I would have him constant and disinterested (selfless) in the service and defence of his king, prince, and country, and neither be bribed nor frightened from his duty".¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ Lyon in Mourning, Vol. I, p. 32-33, 35. Trial and Execution of Lord Balmerino; Prisoners of the Forty Five, p. 219, 277

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., Vol. III, p. 132. Last Speech of Dr. Cameron before his execution.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 137. Letter from Dr. Cameron to his son in France.

Martyrs may be few but their faith is absolute. Hard and durable the faith of their followers proved to be. Whatever other effects "the Forty-Five" had upon Scottish life, it divided Scottish Episcopalianism into two bitterly opposed and hostile communities, the Non Juring Jacobites and the English Qualified Episcopalians. The Church was divided as surely as if it had been cleft in two with a sword.

Would this gulf ever be bridged? Would these two Episcopal parties divided by Jacobitism ever come to terms with each other?

NON JUROR AND ENGLISH QUALIFIED

In the years before 1760 this situation in Scotland was encountered by Bishop Pococke during his "Three Tours of Scotland", and duly noted. Pococke was an Englishman by birth and an Irishman by adoption, an honorary citizen of no fewer than 7 Scottish cities and royal burghs. He was no Presbyterian but a loyal and distinguished prelate of his own Church, and a strong supporter of the reigning House.¹⁶⁰ During his Tour in Scotland in 1747 Bishop Pococke preached in Edinburgh for an Episcopal minister, a Dr. Grant.¹⁶¹ This Dr. Grant had been an assistant minister at Inveresk, but had gone to London, and had been licensed as a Presbyter of the Church of England by the Bishop of London. On his return to Scotland he had opened a Qualified English Meeting House in Skinner's Close, Edinburgh. Bishop

¹⁶⁰Pococke, Tours in Scotland, p. XXXI

¹⁶¹Ibid., p. 2 and 50. Edinburgh Evening Courant, 31st May, 1760.

Pococke returned to Scotland in 1750, and for a much longer Tour in 1760. In his diary for 1760 he gives very clear indications of the rise and spread of English Qualified Chapels in practically every sizeable Scottish town. About his Third Tour the Cambridge Chronicle noted that he was the only bishop of the Church of England since the Revolution to preach and confirm in Scotland.¹⁶² "He preached and confirmed in the English Church at Elgin, and continued to do so in every other of that persuasion which he had occasion to be near". At Elgin¹⁶³ the Bishop noted that there was a strong English Chapel supported by the Duke of Gordon's tenants "who having been Papists came over with the present Duke's grandfather to the Church of England". At Banff¹⁶⁴ he found an English Chapel supported by 600 souls: at Old Deer¹⁶⁵ a congregation of 1,000. He notes two Non Juring, and two English Chapels in Aberdeen;¹⁶⁶ at Peterhead¹⁶⁷ an English Chapel (300); and at Montrose¹⁶⁸ "a handsome Chapel of the Church of England (1,000). At Brechin¹⁶⁹ he notes; "An English Church here consisting of 350 souls in and about the town: there was a non

¹⁶² Pococke, Tours in Scotland, p. LIII. Cambridge Journal, October 5th, 1765.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 193.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 194

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 197

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 202

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 211

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 213

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 216

juring congregation and now that there is a licensed minister, many of them come to the chapel".

At Arbroath¹⁷⁰ there is a very small congregation of non jurors. At Dundee¹⁷¹ there is an English Chapel of about 450 in and about the town. Most of the gentlemen in the country are of this congregation, but there is a non juring congregation of about the same size in the town, the majority of whom are women. At Dunblane and Stirling¹⁷² he notes that "most of the gentlemen are of the Church of England", but that the inhabitants of Appin and Glencoe are Episcopal non jurors. At Glasgow¹⁷³ there is a small non juring congregation, but the English congregation have built a very handsome Church near the Green where the Bishop preached. Finally, he notes, that in the Borders, the incumbent from Carham¹⁷⁴ the last parish in England, often goes across the border to Kelso and "performs divine service to a few of the Episcopal Church settled there, under a legal license".

This was the situation, then, in Scotland when George III ascended the Throne. Loyal Addresses were sent up by the English Qualified Chapels, but none from the Non Juring Bishops.¹⁷⁵ Yet

¹⁷⁰

Pococke, Tours in Scotland, p. 220.

¹⁷¹

Ibid., 223

¹⁷²

Ibid., 293, 96.

¹⁷³

Ibid., 350; p. 50 Glasgow Journal, 29th May, 1760.

¹⁷⁴

Ibid., 350.

¹⁷⁵

Stephen, T. History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, 371-372

from 1760 onwards conditions became more tolerable for the Non Jurors. People began to meet in numbers in excess of those laid down by the Penal Acts, and chapels began to be reopened or rebuilt.¹⁷⁶ The Penal Acts, however, still remained on the Statute Book. Prince Charles Edward Stuart still lived in exile. The English Chapels remained firmly in opposition to the Non Jurors, denying the authority of their Bishops, and seeking orders from the Bishops in England, or from visiting Irish Bishops.¹⁷⁷

No change in this situation occurred until the Prince's death in 1788, upon which it was resolved by the Synods of the Church that they could now consider themselves free to pray for King George. An Edict¹⁷⁸ was issued by the Episcopal College to this end, and prayers were said on 25th May, 1788. Letters were sent to Lord Sidney,¹⁷⁹ one of the Secretaries of State, "to lay their submission at the foot of the throne". On 28th June, Lord Sidney replied that he had not failed to lay their letters before the King, and had received the royal command to acquaint them

¹⁷⁶ Stephen, T., History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 391. John Skinner at Aberdeen had a large dwelling house built the two Upper floors of which were fitted up as a Chapel. No structure that resembled a Church could as yet be built, 1777.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 385. Dr. Trail, Bishop of Down and Connor ordained Mr. William Laing at Peterhead and Mr. Charles Cordiner at Arbroath.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 413-4. Edict of Episcopal College dated 25th May, 1788.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 415. Letters to Lord Sidney, and to Archbishop of Canterbury and Archbishop of York seeking their help in the repeal of the Penal Laws.

that "His Majesty received with great satisfaction this proof of your attachment to his person and family".

The Prayers for King George, however, met with opposition from some of the staunch Jacobite families.¹⁸⁰ Mr. Oliphant of Gask wrote to his Chaplain telling him that since he had begun nominal prayers for King George he had incapacitate himself from officiating at Gask, and his gown would be sent to him by the carrier. Charles Halket stormed out of the Church at Meiklefolla when King George was first prayed for, and did not enter it again for 20 years. Mr. Roger, of St. Andrew's, Aberdeen, said that Bishop Skinner might "pray the ckness aff his breeks" before he would join in prayers for King George.¹⁸¹

Bishop Ross, of Dunblane, old and in his dotage, and Mr. Brown, of Montrose refused to move with the times, and tried to form a remnant Jacobite schism. Brown persuaded Bishop Rose to consecrate him, and he afterwards ordained a Mr. Donald Mackintosh. These two ministered to their Jacobite followers in the inaccessible fastnesses of the Grampians, and went as far east as Banff; but their movement did not long survive.¹⁸²

What did the submission of 1788 mean? By what reasoning did

¹⁸⁰Episcopal Chest MSS, Edinburgh, Nos. 1155-1174, relate to this period, and deal with the Nominal Prayers to be said for King George III, and with Royal Addresses; No. 1155 Bishop Abernethie Drummond's Address to Edinburgh as to Nominal Prayers and Submission; 1156 Edinburgh Clergy's Address against Cardinal York's right to the Crown; No. 1157. Opinion of Aberdeen Clergy as to Compliance with the Government.

¹⁸¹Walker, W., Life of Bishop Jolly, p. 41-42

¹⁸²Stephen, T., History of the Church of Scotland, Vol. IV, p. 414
Neale, J.M., Life and Times of Bishop Torry, p. 12-13

the Non Jurors convince themselves that they were now free to pray for King George? Was such an act in any sense to be taken as a repudiation of their former principles? Even although Prince Charles was dead, by what right did they imagine King George reigned?

Cheyne tries to answer such questions in his "Vindication".¹⁸³ He maintains that the witness of the Non Jurors since the Revolution has been not only a witness to Episcopacy, but for a "great principle of Christian morality - whether it was lawful in any case for subjects to resist the supreme power, and free themselves from the evils of misgovernment by means of their own devising, without regard to God's law".

Although the Bishops at the time of the Revolution were bound by the oaths they had taken to King James, this was a personal obligation, and could hardly be said to be binding on their successors. At any time they might have freed themselves from the discomforts of their position by recognising the existing government. "But such an act of recognition", says Cheyne, "as long as James II or his representative survived, and asserted his claim to their allegiance, could not have been made without approving the principle involved in the Revolution of 1688, by which the monarch was dethroned". So we come back again to the doctrine of the Divine ordering of Kings. How could the death of Prince Charles effect this theory?

¹⁸³Cheyne, P., The Authority and Use of the Scottish Communion Office Vindicated, 20-21.

Cheyne says: "A recognition of the existing government, on the part of the Church of Scotland, involved no recognition of the revolution principle. It was in possession; no other power came into competition with it; no one demanded their allegiance but the occupant of the throne, and the bishops and clergy hastened to tender it, pledging their fidelity to him as their king to whom they before submitted as having power".

Is not this merely a belated recognition of Kingship de facto? If they had really wished to continue to witness to their belief in the Divine ordering of Kings, it mattered not whether Charles was dead or alive, the right Divine to the throne did not belong to the House of Hanover. They could still have witnesses to this article of their faith by refusing to pray for King George. The crisis in which the death of Prince Charles involved the Non Jurors was almost as great as that which the Bishops had faced one hundred years before. The principle of Divine Right, if they still firmly adhered to it, might now lead them into a wilderness, from which this time there could be no hope of return. Now an English Qualified Episcopacy, equal in strength to their own party, and likely to increase, might become the Scottish Episcopal Church, socially acceptable, by law tolerated, virtually established. What would become of them, and of their history then? No doubt these realities played a part in the Non Jurors' appreciation of the situation in which they found themselves in 1788.

This is indicated in their speeches, although it is not so

baldly stated. Mr. Jolly¹⁸⁴ (afterwards Bishop Jolly) in a speech which he made at his Diocesan Synod hoped that compliance with the present Government would not imply that they adopted those principles which brought about the Revolution, and involved them in the guilt of rebellion and resistance. He still remains loyal to his Jacobite principles: but he stresses that in the action the Church is now proposing to take other principles play their part. He names some of them - "the direction of God", "the glory of his Name", "the healing of Schism", and "the enlargement of His Church".

What lay behind these laudable theological motives? Was it not the fear that to go on witnessing to the Divine Right of Kings as a principle of Faith was to sign their own death warrant? Certain it is that if there had been no "Prayers for King George" in 1788, there could have been no Repeal of the Penal Acts in 1792, and no Union with the English Qualified Party in 1804. Yet the Jacobitism of the Non Jurors died hard. In 1792 it was still strong enough to prevent them as a body taking the Oath of Abjuration, as it was proposed by the Lord Chancellor that they should do.¹⁸⁵ This would have involved them in a complete theological and legal repudiation of their historic Jacobitism. This they were not prepared to do: and have never done.

In 1804 the issue of the Abjuration Oath was never raised. Acceptance of the 39 Articles of the Church of England was deemed

¹⁸⁴ Walker, Life of Bishop Jolly, Friendly Address, p. VI-VIII.

¹⁸⁵ Walker, Memoir of Bishop Gleig, p. 220.

to be a sufficient declaration of loyalty to the Crown.¹⁸⁶

One view of these events might be that in the end the English Qualified Party won the day; that it is they who saved the Episcopal Church in Scotland.

This would be too facile a view. The Submission of 1788 and the Union of 1804 ensured that the Scottish succession of Bishops was preserved, and with it was preserved the hundred years of resistance for the sake of Jacobitism woven into the essential fabric of their Church. Submission was, perhaps, a small price to pay for such a prize.

Two questions remain. First - What would have happened within Scottish Episcopalianism if the lineal descent of the House of Stuart had not failed?

It is surely right to suppose that there would still be in Scotland a Non Juring Communion, preserving its own Episcopal Succession, devoted to the principle of the Divine Ordering of Kings as an article of its Faith, supporting by its presence the romantic claims of a contemporary exiled Pretender. Again, it must be assumed that the English Qualified Party would have maintained its witness, and would have remained an Episcopal Church which had been forced to turn to the Established Church in England for its ethos and its Orders. If the House of Stuart had not failed Scottish Episcopalianism might well have found itself a permanently divided Communion.

¹⁸⁶ Walker, Life of Bishop Jolly, p. 12.

The second question is more difficult. How far have the concepts which supported Jacobitism, that is, Divine Order and Lineal Succession, been transferred over into the doctrinal categories in which Episcopacy itself came to be conceived?

There is a marked similarity between the theory of God ordained, institutionalized Kingship and the theory of the Divinely instituted monarchical Bishop.

Historically and theologically both these theories have been rejected by Presbyterianism; never more decisively than in the years between the Revolution and the Second Rebellion.

The absolute conception of the Divinely ordered monarchical Bishop has met with the same fate in Scotland as the conception of the Divinely ordered King. Not, we suspect, primarily because the Episcopal Church supported the exiled House of Stuart, but because, to Presbyterian minds, there is a similar flaw in both theories of Divine absolutism.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

MANUSCRIPTS

Edinburgh University Library MSS. Carstares Letters MSS,
D.K. 1. 1¹; D.K. 1. 1²; D.K. 2. 20/7; D.C. 7. 77;
La II, 407; La II, 577; La II, 685.

New College Library, Edinburgh. MS Book, MS Relating to
Presbyterians and Episcopalians in Parishes 1689-1694.

Episcopal College, Edinburgh, Jolly Kist MSS. MS. Nos. 1-1100;
Correspondence of Bishop Alexander between 9.7.1718 and
24.9.1759.

Episcopal Chest, Edinburgh. MSS. Papers Relating to the Diocese
of Aberdeen. 1-34; Miscellaneous MSS 35-150; Fragments of
Sermons and Addresses 207-249; Miscellaneous MSS 250-365;
Papers Relating to Diocese of Dunkeld 456-460; Papers Relating
to the Diocese of Edinburgh 468-576; Letters of Bishop John
Falconer, 599-619; Papers Relating to the District of Fife
620-630.

Episcopal Chest, Edinburgh MSS. Miscellaneous Papers of Bp.
Robert Forbes 632-684; Letters of Bp. David Fairbairn 685-
701; Letters of Bp. John Fullarton 702-717; Letters of
Bp. James Gadderar 718-757; Letters of Drs. George and
James Garden 757-768; Letters of Bp. Andrew Gerard 769-772
Papers Relating to the Diocese of Glasgow 773-777; Letters
of William Harper 790-811; State of the Highlands, Clans,
Schools etc. 812-817.

Episcopal Chest, Edinburgh. MSS. Letters of Bp. W. Irvine
818-819; Letters of Bp. Robert Keith 820-932; Papers
Relating to Liturgical Matters 1013-1052; Letters of Bp. A.
Miller 1062-1075; Miscellaneous MSS 1076-1125; Papers
Relating to the Dioceses of Moray, Ross and Sutherland
1126-1144; Nominal Prayers for King George III and Royal
Addresses 1155-1174; English Non Jurors 1179-1229.

Episcopal Chest, Edinburgh. MSS. Papers Relating to the Northern
Clergy 1228-1249; Letters of Bp. John Ochterlonie 1351-1363;
Letters of Bp. Alex. Rose 1801-1847; Letters of Bp. John
Sage 1974-1989; Letters and Papers of Bp. Seabury 1987-2027.

Register House, Edinburgh, Records MSS. Presbytery of Abertarff
CH. 2. 7. Vol. I; Presbytery of Alford CH. 2. 8. Vol. I;
Presbytery of Elgin CH. 2. 144. Vols. 5; Presbytery of
Tain CH. 2. 348. Vols. 3,7; Presbytery of Arbroath CH. 2. 15
Vols. 3,5; Presbytery of Aberdeen CH. 2. 1. Vols. 5,8.

Register House, Edinburgh, Records MSS. Presbytery of Edinburgh CH. 2. 121. Vols. 9, 15; Presbytery of Dunoon CH. 2. III, Vols. 4, 5; Presbytery of Fordoun CH. 2. 157. Vols. 4, 6; Presbytery of Brechin CH. 2. 40. Vols. 6, 7, 12; Presbytery of Perth CH. 2. 299. Vols. 8, 9, 16; Presbytery of Dundee CH. 2. 103. Vols. 7, 8, 9. 12; Presbytery of Dunkeld CH. 2. 106. Vol 3; Presbytery of Inveraray CH 2. 190. Vols, 2, 3.

Register House, Edinburgh, Records, MSS. Synod of Dumfries CH. 2 98. Vols. 1, 2, 3; Synod of Galloway CH. 2. 165; Vol. 3; Synod of Merse and Teviotdale CH. 2. 265, Vols. 1, 3; Synod of Clydesdale CH. 2. 464. Vol. 2; Synod of Moray CH. 2 271. Vols. 5, 6; Synod of Angus and Mearns CH. 2. 12. Vols. 3, 4, 7; Synod of Ross and Sutherland CH. 2. 312. Vols. 1, 4; Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale CH. 2. 252. Vols. 8, 11, 12.

Register House, Edinburgh, Records, MSS. State Papers Scotland. Church Books, 56. Vols. 1-3; Letter Books 55. Vols. 1-13; Letters and Papers 54. Vol. 3-45, T.56. Vols. 24, 25. North Britain; Warrant Books 57, Vols. 15-34.

Register House, Edinburgh. Records of Commission of General Assembly of Church of Scotland.

Vol. 1701-1706.	Ch. 1/4/1
" 1706-1712	" 2
" 1702-1712	" 3
" 1713-1717	" 4
" 1718-1729	" 5
" 1721-1726	" 6
" 1730-1736	" 7
" 1760-1762	" 8

Register House, Edinburgh. Royal Letters, Addresses of Commissioners. Ch. 1. 5. 7. 1719-1858.

Register House, Edinburgh. Miscellaneous Church Correspondence Vol. 6. 1654-1709. Ch. 1. 5. 6.

Register House, Edinburgh. Minutes of Royal Bounty Commission Vols. 1728-1729. Ch. 1. 5. 72; Vols. 1755-1760. Ch. 1. 5. 73. Report by those appointed to visit the Highlands and Islands where Itinerants and Catechists are employed 1760. Ch. 1. 5. 80.

Register House, Edinburgh. Records, MSS. Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge; Minutes of General Meetings. Vols. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. March 11th 1718 - January 3rd 1760; Minutes of Directors Meetings, Vols. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. March 11th 1714 - January 4th 1759.

Register House, Edinburgh, Records MSS. Campbell of Stonefield Papers.

Register House, Edinburgh. Clanranald Papers and Letters. 1693-1761. Nos. 29-87.

Register House, Edinburgh. Lord Forbes Collection. Letters
1688-1760. Nos. 567-732.

Register House, Edinburgh. Dundas of Ochtertyre; Letters 1697-
1769. Nos. 7-46.

Register House, Edinburgh. Dundas of Dundas Papers; Sec. VI.
Letters 1587-1830. Nos. 623-633; Sec. VIII. Papers Relating
to Ecclesiastical Affairs.

Register House, Edinburgh. Abercairney Muniments. Sec. II.
Personal Papers and Letters. Nos. 367-391; Sec. 6. Jacobite
Risings of 1715 and 1745. Nos. 938-948.

Register House, Edinburgh. Kintore House Papers; Sec. 7.
Correspondence of Sir John Carstairs of Kilconquhar, 1716-
1736; Sir John Carstairs was a prisoner in Edinburgh Castle
after the Fifteen Rebellion and was sent to Carlisle for trial.

Register House, Edinburgh. Airlie Muniments; Vol. III. Sec. 46.
Papers Relating to the Church; Sec. 51. Covenanters and the
Airlie Troops in Ayrshire, 1674-1732; Vol. II. Sec. 34.
Personal Correspondence of the Airlie Family, 1577-1899;
1751-1768.

Bodleian Library, Oxford. Rawlinson MSS 985. Letters from
Scottish Bishops to Bishop Compton; Tanner MSS 459.
Archbishop Sancrofts Papers on the Revolution Crisis; Tanner
MSS. Vol. XXVIII. 279. Letter from Archbishop Ross to Sancroft.
December 11, 1688.

Christ Church Library, Oxford. Wake MSS. CCXLIII. Vol. XV;
CCLI. Vol. XVIII; COLV. Vol. XXII; CCCXXIII, No. 5.
Papers on Scottish Affairs; Petitions from Scottish
Episcopalian Ministers to Bishop Wake.

Lambeth Palace Library MSS. Tenison MSS 639-928; Gibson MSS
929-943; Miscellaneous MSS 943-1174. Papers on Scottish
Affairs; Letters from Scottish Bishops to the Archbishop of
Canterbury.

British Museum, London. Harleian MSS. 3 Vols. 3783, 3784, 3785;
Collection of Archbishop Sancrofts Letters.

PAMPHLETS

(Chronological Order)

1688-1761

1688, London. An Important Query for Protestants: Can a Popish Ruler propagate the Reformed Religion?

1689, London. A Vindication of the Divines of the Church of England who have sworn Allegiance to King William and Queen Mary from the Imputations of Apostacy and Perjury which are cast upon them upon that Account, in the now published History of Passive Obedience by One of those Divines.

1689, Obedience due to the present King, notwithstanding our Oaths to the Former. Written by a Divine of the Church of England. A First Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 2, p. 577.

The True Character of a Churchman, showing the False Pretences to that Name. A First Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 2, p. 553.

A Speech to His Highness the Prince of Orange: by a true Protestant of the Church of England, as established by law. A First Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 1, p. 346.

Reasons Why the Rector of P _____ took the Oath of Allegiance to William and Mary. (Whether this grave piece was written in jest or earnest, it contains the casuistry of many Jacobites, who took the Oath). A First Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 1, p. 430.

1689, London. The Present Case Stated. Or, The Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy no Badges of Slavery.

MDCLXXXIX, London. An Examination of the Scruples of Those who refuse to take the Oath of Allegiance, by a Divine of the Church of England (Peter Allix. DD.)

MDCLXXXIX, London. An Enquiry into the present state of Affairs. Whether we owe Allegiance to the King in these Circumstances? And whether we are bound to treat with him, and call him back again or not? by Gilbert Burnet.

1689, Edinburgh. A Letter from the Meeting of the Estates of Scotland to the King of England in Answer to His Majestys letter direct to them.

1689, London. An Account of the Proceedings of the Estates of Scotland.

- 1689, Edinburgh. The Grievances represented by the Estates of Scotland to the King's Majesty to be redressed in Parliament. Together with His Majesty's instructions to his Commissioner for redressing the same.
- 1689, Edinburgh. A Letter from the West to a Member of the Meeting of the Estates of Scotland.
- 1689, Edinburgh. Some Weighty Considerations proposed to the Members of the ensuing Assembly of the Estates of Scotland.
- 1689, Edinburgh. The Declaration of the Estates of the Kingdom of Scotland containing the Claim of Right and the offer of the Crown to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary.
- A Speech by a Member of the Convention of the Estates of Scotland, 1689. A Collection of State Tracts During the Reign of King William III, Vol. 3 p. 437-439. London MDCCV.
- 1689, A Vindication of the Proceedings of the Convention of the Estates in Scotland. A Collection of State Tracts During the Reign of King William III, Vol. 3 p. 441-465. London MDCCV.
- 1689, The late Proceedings and Votes of the Parliament of Scotland Vindicated. A Collection of State Tracts During the Reign of King William III, Vol. 3 p. 471-493. London MDCCV.
- 1689, London. Five Letters from a Gentleman in Scotland to his Friend in London. A Compleat Collection of Papers in 12 Parts, Part 6.
- Some Reflections upon His Highness the Prince of Orange's Declaration. (Declaration supposed to have been written by Burnet). A First Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 1, p. 291.
- An Answer to a Paper, intituled, Reflections on the Prince of Orange's Declaration. (This Answer is probably written by Burnet). A First Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 1, p. 303.
- 1689, London. His Highness the Prince of Orange's Speech to the Scots Lords and Gentlemen, Jan. 7, 1689. A Compleat Collection of Papers in 12 Parts, Part 6.
- 1689, London. A Memorial for His Royal Highness the Prince of Orange in relation to the Affairs of Scotland by Two Persons of Quality.
- 1689, London. A Memorial for H.H. the Prince of Orange in Relation to the Affairs of Scotland. Together with the Address of the Presbyterian Party in that Kingdom.
- 1690, London. A Brief and True Account of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland Occasioned by the Episcopalians since the year 1660.
- 1690, London. Reflections upon a Form of Prayer lately set forth for the Jacobites of the Church of England. (A Jacobite Form of Prayer and Humiliation).

- 1689, London. Obedience Due to the Present King Notwithstanding our Oaths to the Former, by a Divine of the Church of England (Francis Fullwood).
1690. Some Questions Resolved concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland, by Alex. Cunningham.
- 1690, London. The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland truly Represented, to which is added for probation, the attestation of many unexceptional witnesses to every particular etc. by a Lover of the Church and his Country. Attributed to the Rev. Geo. Garden.
- 1690, London. The Danger of the Church of England from a General Assembly of Covenanters in Scotland etc. by a True Son of the Church (A. Munro)
- 1690, London. An Account of the Present Persecution in Scotland, in several Letters. First Letter by Thomas Morer; Second and Third Letters by John Sage; Fourth Letter by A. Munro.
- 1690, London. The Case of the Afflicted Clergy in Scotland truly Represented, by John Sage.
- 1690, London. Some Queries Resolved Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterian Government in Scotland.
- 1690, London. Obedience and Submission to the Present Government Demonstrated from Bishop Overall's Convocation Books, by Zachary Taylor.
- 1690, London. A Word to a Wavering Levit. Or, an Answer to Dr. Sherlock's reasons concerning the Taking of Oaths. A First Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 2, p. 546.
- 1690, London. An Answer to a late Pamphlet entitled Obedience and Submission to the present Government, with a Postscript in Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance, by Thomas Wagstaffe.
- 1691, London. An Historical Relation of the late Presbyterian General Assembly held at Edinburgh. In a Letter from a Person in Edinburgh to his Friend in London, by John Cockburn of Ormiston.
- 1691, Edinburgh. An Account of the Purging and Planting of the Congregation of Dalkeith.
- A Letter to Dr. Sherlock in Vindication of that part of Josephus's History which gives an Account of Iaddus the High Priest submitting to Alexander the Great while Darius was living. Against the Answer to the piece entitled Obedience and Submission to the Present Government, by William Lloyd, DD. London, MDCXCI.

- 1691, London. A Discourse of God's Ways of Dispensing of Kingdoms, by William Lloyd.
- 1691, London. A Continuation of the Historical Relation of the late General Assembly, A. Munro.
- 1691, London. An Historical Relation of the late General Assembly held in Edinburgh, from October 16 to November 13, in the year 1690; in a Letter from a Person in Edinburgh to his friend in London, A. Munro.
- 1691, London. Presbyterian Inquisition as it was lately practised against the Professors of the College of Edinburgh. August and September, 1690, A. Munro.
- 1691, London. A late Letter concerning the Sufferings of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland, A. Munro.
- 1691, Edinburgh. A Vindication of the Church of Scotland. Being an Answer to a Paper, Intituled Some Questions Concerning Episcopal and Presbyterianial Government in Scotland by Gilbert Rule.
- 1691, Edinburgh. A Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland. Being an Answer to Five Pamphlets, by Gilbert Rule.
- 1691, London. The Case of the Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers Stated and Resolved according to Scripture and Reason and the Principles of the Church of England, by William Sherlock
- 1691, London. Their Present Majesties Government Proved to be Thoroughly Settled and that we may submit to it, without Asserting the Principles of Mr. Hobbs. Occasioned by some late Pamphlets against the Rev. Dr. Sherlock.
- 1691, London. A Vindication of the Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers in Reply to an Answer to a late Pamphlet, by William Sherlock.
- 1692, A Letter giving an Account of all the treatises that have been published with relation to the present persecutions of the Church of Scotland, by A. Munro.
- 1692, Vindication of the Address made to the General Assembly made by the Episcopal Clergy.
- 1693, London. An Account of the late Establishment of the Presbyterian Government by the Parliament of Scotland, anno 1690, together with methods by which it was settled, and the consequences of it etc., A. Munro.

- 1693, London. The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence, And Some Remarks on Mr. Rules late Vindication of the Kirk. (Not by Robert Calder: Joint effort of Gilbert Crockat and John Munro. See Kirkton's Church History, p. 194).
- 1693, London. Some Remarks upon a late Pamphlet Entitled An Answer to the Scots Presbyterian Eloquence, by W_____ S _____
- 1694, London. The Queries and Protestation of the Scots Episcopal Clergy against the Authority of the Presbyterian General Assemblies and Committees given in to the Committee of the General Assembly at Aberdeen, June 29th, 1694. Together with the Committees Answer and Proceedings, with Reflections upon the Queries, by George Ridpath.
- 1702, London. The New Association of Men called Moderate Church Men with the Whigs and Fanaticks, to undermine and blow up the Present Church and Government. With a Supplement on Occasion of the New Scotch Presbyterian Covenant, by Charles Leslie.
- 1702, Some Reasons Humbly offered, why the English Oath of Abjuration should not be imposed upon the subjects of North Britain, especially the Ministers of the Gospel there.
- Address of the Episcopal Clergy to the Queen for a Toleration, March, 13th, 1703, with a Commission to Dr. Skene and Dr. Scot to carry it up. Boyers Queen Anne's Reign, Vol. II, p. 464.
- 1703, A Seasonable Alarm for Scotland, in a Letter from a Gentleman in the City.
- 1703, Edinburgh. An Apology for Mr. James Webster's Sermon, preached on 25th July, 1703. Before his Grace, Her Majesty's High Commissioner, and the Honourable Estates of Parliament, by An Unknown Hand.
- 1703, Printed. A Letter from a Presbyterian Minister in the Country to a Member of Parliament and also of the Commission of the Church concerning Toleration and Patronages, by J. Bannantyne, Minister of Lanark.
- My Son Fear thou the Lord and the King: Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King as Supreme, or unto Governours. A Sermon preached on the 30th Day of January, MDCCIIII, at Edinburgh, by Mr. Andrew Cant, Edinburgh MDCCIIII

The Case of the Episcopal Clergy and of those of the Episcopal Persuasion considered as to granting them a Toleration and Indulgence. Second Edition. Revised and Cleared from the Mistakes of the Gentleman's Letter, by George Garden, MDCCIII.

1703, A Letter to the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland, by Geo. Garden.

1703, Petition of the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland to the Queen with Her Majesty's gracious Answer.

1703, Edinburgh. A Survey of the Case of the Episcopal Clergy and those of the Episcopal Persuasion Considered by Geo. Garden, by James Hadow, Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews.

1703, London. The New Association, Part II. Another and later Scots Presbyterian Covenant, An Answer to some Objections in the Pretended D Foes Explication, by Charles Leslie.

A Few Brief and Modest Reflections Persuading a Just Indulgence to be granted to the Episcopal Clergy and People in Scotland, by Geo. MacKenzie, Earl of Cromarty. MDCCIII.

1703, Edinburgh. A Vindication and Defence of Mr. George Meldrum's Sermon preached May 16th, 1703. Against the Reflections, Censures of the Author of the Examination of Some Things in the Sermon and the Author of Toleration Defended, by George Meldrum.

1703, Edinburgh. An Examination of Three Prelatical Pamphlets, by James Ramsay.

1703, Printed in the Year. A Letter from a Gentleman, to a Member of Parliament concerning Toleration. To which is added a Letter concerning the Grounds and Reasons, why those of the Episcopal Persuasion cannot join in Communion with the Established Church, by James Ramsay, AM. Minister at Eyemouth, afterwards at Kelso.

1703, Edinburgh. The Reduction of Episcopacy unto the Form of Synodical Government. Proposed in 1641 by Archbishop Usher. Proposed again in 1703 for removing the differences in the Church of Scotland.

1703, Printed in the Year. Some Remarks on the late Letter from a Gentleman in the City to a Minister in the Country (By the Rev. Robt. Wylie of Hamilton). And Mr. Williamson's Sermon preached before the late General Assembly. In a Letter from a Person in the Country to his Friend in the City. (By John Sage, Bishop of the Scottish Episcopal Church).

- 1703, Edinburgh. A Full and Final Answer to a Triffling Reply made unto a Paper Entitled Plaindealing with the Presbyterians wherein the Reasonableness and Necessity of a Toleration is maintained against All that is said in the Gentleman's Letter to a Member of Parliament, and Vindication thereof. In a Letter to a Friend (by J. Skene).
- 1703, Edinburgh. A Sermon Preached on 30th January 1703 at Edinburgh by One of the Suffering Clergy of the Kingdom of Scotland.
- 1703, Printed. An Essay Upon Toleration by a sincere lover of the Church and State, by James Webster, Minister of the Tolbooth Church, Edinburgh.
- A Short Answer to a Short Paper intitl'd A Few Brief and Modest Reflections, persuading a Just Indulgence to be granted to the Episcopal Clergy and People in Scotland, by Robert Wylie Minister at Hamilton. MDCCIII.
- 1704, A Letter Dropt in the Street. A Seasonable Advertisement to the Members of the Ensuing General Assembly.
- 1704, The Great Danger of Scotland as to all its Sacred and Civil Concerns from these, who are commonly known by the name of Jacobites.
- 1704, Edinburgh. A Defence of the Vindication of Mr. Meldrum's Sermon Against a Second Assault of the Examiner (Sage) in a Treatise intitl'd The Reasonableness of a Toleration set forth in the form of Four Letters, by the Author of the Sermon.
- 1704, A Watchword to Scotland in Perilous Times.
- 1704, London. The Wolf Stript of his Shepherd's Cloathing. An Answer to a late celebrated book intitl'd Moderation and Virtue, by Charles Leslie, An High Church Man.
- A Preservative against the Principles and Practises of the Non jurors both in Church and State: Or an Appeal to the Consciences and common sense of the Christian Laity, by the Ld. Bishop of Bangor.
- 1705, London. A Sermon concerning the Unhappiness of Absolute Monarchy, by the Bishop of Bangor.
- 1705, Printed. The Divine Right of Episcopacy. Wherein it is shown that there can be no lawful ministry but what comes by Apostolic Succession, by Robert Calder.

- 1705, Mene Tekel: Prelatical Church Principles. A Few Remarks on a Book (by John Sage) entitled The Reasonableness of Toleration to those of the Episcopal Persuasion in Four Letters to Mr. Meldrum.
- 1705, London. Cassandra Num. I and Num. II. In an Answer to the Occasional Letter, by Charles Leslie.
- 1706, London. A Warning for the Church of England, by Charles Leslie.
- 1707, Edinburgh. A Letter from a Member of the Commission of the late General Assembly to a Minister in the Country, Concerning Present Dangers (Abjuration Oath).
- 1708, Edinburgh. The Scots Narrative Examined. The Case of the Episcopal Ministers in Scotland Stated, and the late Treatment of them in the City of Edinburgh enquired into, by Daniel Defoe.
- 1708, A Letter to the author (Defoe) of the Review concerning Collections made for the support of the indigent Episcopal Clergy.
- 1708, A Narrative of the late treatment of the Episcopal Ministers within the City of Edinburgh since March last 1708. With a Postscript.
- 1708, Edinburgh. Presbyterian Persecution Examined. With an Essay on the Nature and Necessity of Toleration in Scotland.
- 1709, London. The Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State set forth in a Sermon preached before the Rt. Hon. the Ld. Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens of London. At the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on 5th November, 1709, by H. Sacheverell, DD.
- 1709, London. The Peril of Being Zealously Affected, but not Well: Or reflections on Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon.
- 1710, Edinburgh. A Short Account of the Divine Original of Episcopacy from Scripture the Fathers and Councils and the constant practice of the Universal Church. Being an Answer to a Letter from Mr. James Sands, Birsay, by Mr. James Lyon.
- 1710, A Letter concerning Allegiance, written by the Ld. Bishop of London, To a Clergyman in Essex, presently after the Revolution. To which are added some Queries occasioned by the late Address of his Lordship and the Clergy of London and Westminster. A First Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 3, p. 595.

- 1710, London. The Good Old Cause Further Discussed in a Letter to the author of the Jacobite Hopes Revived.
- 1710, London. The True State of the Case of Mr. Greenshields now Prisoner in Tolbooth of Edinburgh.
- 1710, London. An Account of the Life of Dr. Henry Sacheverell.
- 1710, London. The Answer of Henry Sacheverell DD to the Articles of Impeachment exhibited against him by the Hon. House of Commons.
- 1710, London. A Defense of Her Majesty's Title to the Crown, and a Justification of Her entering into a War with France and Spain. In a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on 10th June, 1702, by Henry Sacheverell MA. Being the Discourse referred to in the Doctors answer to the Articles of impeachment against him.
- 1710, London. Dr. Sacheverell's Defence in a Letter to a Member of Parliament.
- A Prelude to the Tryal of Skill between Sacheverelism and the Constitution of the Monarchy of Great Britain, Occasioned by the printing of Dr. Sacheverell's answer to his impeachment. With Reflections upon the Notions of Bishop Sanderson, and the Deans, Hicks, Sherlock and Atterbury, with other clergymen, who have departed from the doctrine of the Church of England, professed in Queen Elizabeth's days.
- 1710, London. The Speech of Henry Sacheverell DD upon his Impeachment at the Bar of the House of Lords, in Westminster Hall, March 7th, 1710.
- 1710, London. The Thoughts of a Country Gentleman upon Reading Dr. Sacheverell's Tryal in a Letter to a Friend.
- 1710, London. A Vindication of the Rev. Dr. Henry Sacheverell from the False, Scandalous and Malicious Aspersions Cast upon him in a late pamphlet entitled The Modern Fanatick, by Dr. Wm. King.
- 1710, London. The Bishop of Salisbury, His Speech in the House of Lords on the first Article of the Impeachment of Dr. Henry Sacheverell.
- 1710, London. A Sermon preached before the Hon. House of Commons, at St. Margaret's Westminster, on Monday January 30, 1710. Being the Anniversary of the Martyrdom of King Charles I, by Richard West, DD. Prebendary of Winchester.

- 1710, London. Some considerations humbly offered to the Rt. Rev. the Ld. Bp. of Salisbury occasioned by his Ldships speech, upon the first article of Dr. Sacheverell's impeachment. Wherein the new doctrine of resisting the supreme Powers, as founded upon political principles, is carefully examined, and proved diametrically opposite to what his Ldship has formerly asserted.
- 1710, The History of Resistance, as Practised by the Church of England, in which tis proved, from most authentic Records, that in every reign since the Reformation of Religion, the said Church hath aided and assisted, justified and approved of such subjects as have defended themselves against the oppressions of their tyrannical though National Princes. Written upon occasion of Mr. Agate's Sermon at Exeter on 30th January. And in defence of the late Revolution, the present establishment, and the Protestant Succession, by John Withers. A First Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 3, p. 572.
- A New Catechism, with Dr. Hiches's 39 Articles. With a Preface relating to the true Interest of Great Britain, both in Church and State. A First Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 3, p. 228.
- Proceedings of the Commons on the Bill in favour of Episcopacy in Scotland, January 1711. Boyers Queen Anne's Reign, Vol. III, p. 39-46.
- 1711, A Seasonable Caution to the General Assembly in a Letter from a Member of Parliament of North Britain to a Minister in Scotland occasioned by the House of Lords Reversing the sentence of Mr. Greenshields.
- A Letter from a Gentleman in Edinburgh to his Friend in London. Giving an Account of the present Proceedings against the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland, for using the English Liturgy there. Edinburgh MDCCXI.
- Presentation of the Duchess of Gordon's Medal and Extract of an Act of Faculty of Law, July 18, 1711. Boyers Queen Anne's Reign. Vol. II, p. 481-484.
- 1711, London. The Present State of Mr. Greenshields Case. In a Letter from a Commoner of North Britain to his Friend in Edinburgh.
- 1711, An Oath to an Invader, and Abjuring the Invaded, dissected and examined upon the following Queries. (Jacobites were very industrious in distributing this Paper in England clandestinely). Boyers Queen Anne's Reign, Vol. II, p. 487.

1712, The Oath of Abjuration Enquired into: In a Letter to a Friend, by Allan Logan.

The Oath of Abjuration Displayed. In its sinful nature and tendency, in its inconsistency with Presbyterian Principles and Covenants; the security it affords to the Church of England. Being the copy of a letter sent to one of the Jurant Ministers of the Presbytery of Dunblane, MDCCXII.

1712, June. Four Sermons by the Bishop of St. Asaph. On Death of Queen Mary, 1694; on Death of Duke of Gloucester, 1701; on Death of King William, 1701; on the Queen's Accession to the Throne; Boyers Queen Anne's Reign, Vol. III, p. 347.

1712, London. A Seasonable Warning and Caution against the Insinuations of Papists and Jacobites in favour of the Pretender. Being a letter from an Englishman at the Court of Hannover, (Daniel Defoe).

A Full Vindication of the Lord Bishop of Edinburgh (Alexander Rose) and the other Administrators of the Charities there from the Calumnies of Mr. George Barclay, Edinburgh MDCCXII.

1712, The Scots Representation to Her Majesty against setting up the English Prayer Book in Scotland.

1712, London. A Letter from a Gentleman in Scotland to his Friend at London, Written from Edinburgh 1711.

1712, A Short Account of the Grievances of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland.

1712, Edinburgh. A Vindication of the Ministers and Ruling Elders of the Church of Scotland who have taken the Abjuration Oath, by Alex. Lauder, Minister at Mordintoun.

1712, London. Good News from Scotland or the Abjuration and the Kirk of Scotland Reconciled, by Archibald Pitcairn.

A Dialogue Betwixt a Minister of the Church of Scotland And Two of the Elders of his Congregation about the Abjuration Oath. by Rev. James Smith, Minister of Cramond, Edinburgh MDCCXII.

1712, March. Scotch Members Account of Patronages, Boyers Queen Anne's Reign, Vol. III, p. 160-163.

A Toleration in Scotland no Breach of the Union, by William Strachan, London, MDCCXII.

1712, A Collection of Papers against the Scots Toleration and Patronages, that have been printed or presented to her Majesty, and the two Houses of Parliament.

A Vindication of the Ministers and Ruling Elders in the Church of Scotland who have refused the Oath of Abjuration, Edinburgh MDCCXII.

Queries to the Scots Innovators in Divine Service and particularly to the Liturgical Party in the Shire of Angus, by John Willison, MDCCXII.

Two Remarkable Addresses from Scotland in favour of the Lineal Succession, 31st July, 1713. From Inverness and Nairn, Also, An Address from Glasgow in a quite different strain, Boyers Queen Anne's Reign, Vol. VII, p. 6-7.

1713, Edinburgh. Some Remarks on a Pamphlet entitled, The Oath of Abjuration Displayed in its Sinful Nature and Tendency, by Hugh Clark.

A Seasonable Warning by the Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland concerning the Danger of Popery, August 19th, 1713, Boyers Queen Anne's Reign, Vol. VII, p.84.

An Essay upon the Design, and References, the Penalty and Offence of the Abjuration Oath, in a Letter to a Presbyterian Minister. From which it will appear, that such of the Ministers of this Church, as have refused the Abjuration, have not walked upon such insufficient grounds, as were represented in some late Pamphlets, by Ebenezer Erskine. MDCCXIII.

Jet Black Prelatick Calumny. In Answer to a Pamphlet Called True Blue Presbyterian Loyalty, by John MacBride, Glasgow MDCCXIII.

An Answer to a Pamphlet, intituled, The Oath of Abjuration Displayed, by Rev. John MacMurdo, Torthorwald, Edinburgh. MDCCXIII.

1713, Edinburgh. An Answer to the Queries upon the Address of the Episcopal Clergy in the City and Suburbs of Edinburgh Presented to Her Majesty in April 1713,

1713, Printed. Some Thoughts Concerning the Peace (of Utrecht) and the Thanksgiving, appointed by Authority to be observed for it. In a Letter from an Elder to a Minister of the Church of Scotland, by George Ridpath.

Address of the Episcopal Clergy of the Diocese of Aberdeen, by Dr. James Garden, Dr. George Garden, and other Clergymen, introduced by the Earl of Mar, 10th April, 1714, Boyers Queen Anne's Reign, Vol. VII, p. 410.

1714, Edinburgh. The Spirit of Slander Exemplified in a Scandalous Pamphlet called, The Jacobite Curse, by Robert Calder.

- 1714, London. Characters of the Court of Hannover with a Word or two to Somebody else, which Nobody has yet thought on.
- 1714, London. An Enquiry into the Grounds of our present fears of Popery and the Pretender. In a Dialogue between my Ld. Panick and George Steady, Esq.
- 1714, London. The Judgement of Whole Kingdoms and Nations, concerning the Rights, Power and Prerogative of Kings, and the Rights, Priviledges and Properties of the People.
- 1714, Edinburgh. A Practical Essay Proving the Christian Religion to be from God. Together with an Apology for the Episcopal Church in Scotland. A Sermon preached in one of the Meeting Houses of the City of Edinburgh on Thursday 28th October, 1714, by William Miln, Episcopal Minister.
- The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland Answer to the Commissioners Speech, the Duke of Athole, 6th May, 1714, by Rev. William Mitchell, Moderator, Boyers Queen Anne's Reign, Vol. VIII, p. 577-589.
- 1714, London. The Scots Nation and Union Vindicated from the Reflections Cast upon them in an Infamous Libel (by Dean Swift), by George Ridpath.
- 1714, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached before his Grace John Duke of Athole Her Majesty's High Commissioner, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, at the Opening of the said Assembly on the 6th May, 1714, by Mr. William Wisheart, One of the Ministers of Edinburgh.
- 1715, London. The Modern Fanatick with a large and true account of the Life, Actions, Endowments, etc. of the famous Dr. Sacheverell, by William Bisset.
- 1715, London. A Sermon preached at Patching, in Sussex, January 20th, 1715. Being the Day of Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for bringing His Majesty to a peaceable and quiet possession of the Throne; and disappointing thereby the Designs of the Pretender, and all his abettors and adherents, by Thomas Blennerhyssett, Rector of Patching and Chaplain to the Rt. Hon. Lionel, Earl of Dorset and Middlesex, KG.
- 1715, London. The Revolution Recommended to our Memories: A Sermon preached at Westminster Abbey, November, 5th, 1715, by Dr. Burscough.

- 1715, A Declaration by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops in and near London, testifying their Abhorrence of the present Rebellion; with an Exhortation to the Clergy and People under their care, to be zealous in their duties to H.M. King George. A Fourth Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol, 4, p. 195.
- 1715, London. A Sermon preached before the King in St. James's Chapel, upon the thirtieth day of January, 1715, being the day of the Martyrdom of King Charles I, by the Most Reverend Father in God, William Ld. Archbishop of Canterbury.
- 1715, London. The Present Delusions of many Protestants considered, In a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of St. Peters Poor, in Broadstreet, November, 5, 1715.
- 1715, London. The Earl of Mar marr'd: A Tragic-Comical Farce by Mr. Phillips.
- 1715, London. A Sermon preached before the Rt. Hon. the Ld. Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on Monday, January 31, 1715, being the Anniversary Fast of the Martyrdom of King Charles I, by William Shorey, AM. and Chaplain to the Rt. Hon. Sir William Humphreys, Bart, Ld. Mayor.
- 1716, London. The Restoration made a Blessing to us by the Protestant Succession. A Sermon preached before the King at the Royal Chapel at St. James, on 29th May, 1716. Being the Anniversary of the Restoration, by the Ld. Bishop of Bangor.
- 1716, London. A Sermon preached before the Hon. House of Commons at St. Margarets Westminster, on the Thirtieth of January, 1715, being the Day of the Martyrdom of King Charles I, by Lancelot Blackburne, DD. Dean of Exeter, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty.
- 1716, London. The Nature, Wisdom and Influence of Considering God the Author of National Blessings. A Sermon preached at the Church of Monmouth at the Assize held for the County of Monmouth, on Friday, March 16th, 1716, by Andrew Cuthbert, MA, Rector of Wolves Newton.
- 1716, London. News From the Dead, In a Letter from Tom Brown, poet. An Account of the Arrival and Behaviour of the Earl of Derwentwater, Oxborough, Gascoigne, Parson Paul, and Justice Hall, in the Elysium Shades. In which are some learned Notes on their several speeches.

- 1716, London. Sermon preached at Ely House Chapel in Holborn on Thursday June 7th, 1716, being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving for the Blessings of God upon His Majesty's Counsels and Arms in suppressing the late unnatural Rebellion, by the Ld. Bp. of Ely (Sixth edition in less than one month).
- 1716, London. A Sermon preached at the Cathedral Church of Worcester, on 1st August, 1716, being the Anniversary of His Majesty's happy Accession to the Crown, by Francis Hare DD, Dean of Worcester, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty.
- 1716, London. A Sermon preached at Ashby-de-la-Zouch in Leicestershire on the Day of Publick Thanksgiving June the 7th, 1716, by John Hartley, MA.
- 1716, Edinburgh. A True and Impartial Account of the Conduct of the Well Affected in the North during the late Rebellion. In a Letter from a Gentleman in Murray to his Correspondent at Edinburgh.
- A Dialogue between an Oak and an Orange Tree, London MDCCXVI.
- 1716, London. Remarks on the Speeches of William Paul, Clerk, and John Hall of Otterburn, Esq., Executed for Rebellion, the 13th July, 1716.
- 1716, London. A Matter of Fact: Being a Short but true Account of the birth, education and ordination of William Paul, Clergyman, who was executed for High Treason, July the 13th, 1716.
- 1716, London. A Letter to the Right Honourable the E____ of____, Concerning the Oath of Abjuration, as it relates to the Church of Scotland in a Bill now depending in Parliament, Signed Philopoliteius.
- 1716, London. A Sermon preached before the House of Commons at St. Margarets Westminster on Thursday 7th June, 1716. Being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for Suppressing the late Unnatural Rebellion, by Thos. Sherlock, DD, Dean of Chichester, Master of the Temple, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty.
- 1716, London. Righteousness the Establishment of the Throne: A Sermon preached at Westminster Abbey, and at Somerset House Chapel, on Wednesday, August 1st, 1716, being the Anniversary of His Majestys happy Accession to the Throne, by John Wright MA.
- 1717, An Apology for such of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland as are Non Jurors.

- 1717, London. The Nature and Duty of a Public Spirit. A Sermon preached at St. James Westminster on St. Davids Day, March I, 1716, by The Lord Bishop of Bangor.
- 1717, London. Remarks on the State Anatomy of Great Britain (by John Tolend), by Richard Fiddes.
- 1717, London. The Second Edition Corrected. The History of Hereditary Right from Cain to Nero. Wherein its Indefeasibleness, and all other such late Doctrines concerning the absolute power of Princes, and the unlimited obedience of subjects, are fully and finally determined, by the Scripture standard of Divine Right. To which is prefixed by way of a modest challenge and address to British and Irish Jacobites, to answer what is said, by the late Rev. Mr. Robert Fleming.
- 1717, London. A Sermon preached before the Hon. House of Commons at St. Margarets, Westminster, on Wednesday 29th of May, 1717, being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God for having put an end to the great Rebellion, by the Restoration of King Charles II, and Royal Family, and the Restoration of the Government, by Andrew Snape, DD, Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty.
- Scotlands Present Circumstances (in relation to the Abjuration Oath) and the present duty of private Christians, with reference thereunto. Chiefly designed for benefit of such as keep Society: and therefore in a homely Scottish dialect familiarly suted to the weakest capacity among them, by a Lover of Peace and Truth (Jas. Bonar). Edinburgh MDCCXVIII.
- Copy of a Letter from Several of the Suffering Clergy in Scotland, to their Correspondent in London. Addressed to Dr. Sharpe, at London. From Aberdeen, 5th June, 1718. Signed by A. Campbell and Jas. Gadderar, A Plea for financial help for distressed clergymen, reckoned at 120. A Third Collection of Somers Tracts, Vol. 4, p. 492.
- 1719, Edinburgh. A Discovery of the Sinfulness of the new scheme of the Oath (Abjuration).
- 1719, Edinburgh. A Discourse: the authors opinion of the Oath of Abjuration, by Mr. Owen
- 1719, Edinburgh. Sermon preached before his Grace John, Earl of Rothes, His Majestys High Commissioner, and the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, at the Opening of the said Assembly, on the 14th May, 1719, by Mr. William Wisheart, Principal of the College of Edinburgh.

- 1721, London. A Sermon preached before the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament Assembled at the Collegiate Church of St. Peters, Westminster, on Monday Jan. 30, 1721. Being the Anniversary of the Martyrdom of King Charles the First, by the Ld. Bp. of Bangor.
- Historical Account of the Settlement in the Episcopal Congregation of Dundee in 1727. Intrusion there in 1743: Being a full and proper reply to a late Pamphlet of Mr. James Dundas.
- 1727, Printed. An Answer in a Letter Sent from one Episcopal Minister to another. In which one personates a Presbyterian, and the other refutes his Arguments.
- 1729, Edinburgh. The State of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, Anno 1729.
- 1730, Edinburgh. The Necessity of Divine Revelation, and Knowledge thereof, in order to Salvation. A Sermon Preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday 5, January, 1730, SPCK Anniversary, by Rev. Mr. John Mattison, one of the ministers of the said Church.
- 1731, Edinburgh. The Truth and Excellency of the Gospel Revelation. A Sermon Preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday, 4th January 1731, SPCK Anniversary Meeting, by Rev. Mr. Robert Kinloch, one of the ministers of the said Church.
- 1732, Edinburgh. Abridgement of the Statutes and Rules of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge.
- 1732, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached before His Majestys High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in the High Church of Edinburgh, on 7th May, 1732, by Archibald Gibson, MA. Minister of the Gospel at St. Ninians (Stirling).
- 1732, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday, Jan. 3, 1732. Upon the occasion of the Annisversary Meeting of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, by William Hamilton, Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.
- 1733, Edinburgh. The Misery of Ignorant and Unconverted Sinners. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday, Jan. 1, 1733, SPCK Anniversary, by James Smith, Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh, and one of the ministers of the City.

- 1734, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached at the Opening of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in the High Church of Edinburgh, on 2nd of May, 1734 before His Majestys High Commissioner, by the Rev. John Goudie, Professor of Divinity in the College of Edinburgh, and Moderator to the former Assembly.
- 1734, Edinburgh. Christ Victorious over the Powers of Darkness, by the light of His preached Gospel. A Sermon preached in Boston, December 12, 1733 at the Ordination of the Rev. Mr. Stephen Parker, Mr. Ebenezer Hindsdell, and Mr. Joseph Seccombe. Chosen by the Commissioners to the Honourable Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge at Edinburgh, to carry the Gospel to the Aboriginal Natives on the borders of New England, by Joseph Sewell, DD. Pastor to a Church of Christ in Boston.
- 1735, Edinburgh. The Propagation of the Gospel and the Blessed Effects therof. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday Jan. 6th, 1735, upon the occasion of the Anniversary Meeting of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, by John Goudie, Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.
- 1736, Edinburgh. The Benefit and Comfort of the Christian Revelation. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday, Jan. 5., 1736, SPCK Anniversary, by Mr. William Brown, one of the ministers of Edinburgh.
- 1737, Edinburgh. The Perpetuity of the Christian Religion. A Sermon Preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday, Jan. 3, 1737, SPCK Anniversary, by Mr. James Nisbet, one of the Ministers of the Gospel in Edinburgh.
- A Letter from a Gentleman in the North to a Minister who has not intimated the Act of Parliament for the more effectual bringing to Justice the Murderers of Captain John Porteous, Edinburgh MDCCXXXVII.
- 1738, Edinburgh. A Seasonable Warning and Admonition to Persons of All Ranks especially to those who are true friends to our present happy Establishment and Constitution. Being the substance of some Sermons preached by a Minister of the Church of Scotland.
- 1740, London. A Speech of the Duke of Argyle upon the State of the Nation, April, 15th, 1740.
- 1740, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached before the Rt. Hon. Ld.. Provost, Magistrates and Town Council of Edinburgh at their Election on Tuesday, 30th Sept. 1740, by Mr. Webster.

1741, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached at the Opening of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in the High Church of Edinburgh, on 14th May, 1741, before His Majestys Commissioner, by Mr. George Logan, One of the Ministers of Edinburgh, and Moderator to the former Assembly.

1742, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday, Jan. 4th, 1742. Upon the Occasion of the Anniversary Meeting of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, by George Wishart, MA, One of the Ministers of Edinburgh.

1744, Glasgow. A Sermon preached in the New Church of Aberdeen upon 11th April, 1744, being the National Fast Day. Wherein a particular Warning is given against the tolerating of Popery, Prelacy and other prevailing evils. To which is a prefixed a Preface taking notice, II. On the Popish and Jacobite Party in the North, by John Bisset, MA. Minister of the Gospel in Aberdeen.

A Letter in Answer to the Pretenders Eldest Son, by way of Answer to his second Manifesto, Oct. 10th 1745, Scots Magazine Nov., 1745, p. 562.

Letter sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Clergy of his Diocese, 9th September, 1745, Scots Magazine October 1745, p. 460.

The Humble Address of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, met at Edinburgh, 13th November, 1745. Presented by the Marquis of Tweeddale, Scots Magazine, November, 1745, p. 523.

Bishop of Durhams Letter to his Clergy, October 22nd, 1745, Scots Magazine October, 1745, p. 460.

The Humble Address of the Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland, in the City of Edinburgh, November 12th, 1745. Presented by the Marquis of Tweeddale, Scots Magazine November 1745, p. 524.

Address by City of Edinburgh, 7th September, 1745, Scots Magazine September, 1745, p. 426.

Address unto the Reverend the Ministers of the Several Kirks and Congregations of the City of Edinburgh by Heads of Families and Parishioners, Scots Magazine, October 1745, p. 462.

A Seasonable Warning and Exhortation of the Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, met at Edinburgh, 15th November, 1745, Scots Magazine November 1745, p. 517.

Memorial and Admonition of the Rev. Synod of Glasgow and Ayr met at Glasgow, 1st October, 1745, Scots Magazine, November 1745, p. 475.

Bishop of Herefords Letter to his Clergy, September 20th, 1745, Scots Magazine October, 1745, p. 460.

A Memorial Concerning the Unnatural Rebellion begun in the North West of Scotland, carried on mostly by Highland Clans, by which many in this part of the country have already suffered considerably; which not only threatens a greater devastation in the land, but the destruction of the most valuable interests of Britain. Read in the Church of Ormiston, November 10th, 1745, Scots Magazine November, 1745, p. 474.

1745, London. A Sermon preached on Occasion of the Present Rebellion in Scotland, at the Parish Church of St. James, Westminster, and the Chapels belonging to it, October 6th, 1745, by the Ld. Bp. of Oxford.

Address by County of York, 24th September, 1745, Scots Magazine September, 1745, p. 427.

1745, York. A Sermon preached at the Cathedral Church of York, September 22nd, 1745; On Occasion of the present Rebellion in Scotland, by the Ld. Archbishop of York.

1745, York. A Speech made by his Grace the Ld. Archbishop of York at the presenting an Association entered into at the Castle of York, September 24th, 1745.

1746, Act for more easy Trial of the Rebels, March 1746, Scots Magazine, March 1746, p. 129.

1746, Edinburgh. The Active Testimony of the True Presbyterians of Scotland, being a brief abstract of acknowledgement of Sins, and Engagement to Duties, As also, A First and Second Declaration and Testimony against the late unjust invasion of Scotland by Charles Pretended Prince of Wales, and William pretended Duke of Cumberland and their Malignant Emissaries.

Address from the Magistrates and City of Glasgow, February 12th, 1746, Scots Magazine February 1746, p. 95.

1746, London. The Occasional Writer: Containing an Answer to the Second Manifesto of the Pretenders Eldest Son, which bears date at the Palace of Holyroodhouse, the 10th Day of October, 1745.

1746, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, May 18th, 1746. Before his Grace the Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by Hugh Blair, AM. One of the Ministers of Canongate.

Some Considerations of the Law of Forfeiture for High Treason occasioned by a Clause in the late Act, for making it Treason to correspond with the Pretenders Sons, or any of their agents. London, MDCCXLVI.

Protesters Vindicated or A Just and Necessary Defence of Protesting against withdrawing from this National Church of Scotland on account of her many gross and continued Defections. More particularly. Her approving of and going into the legal establishment of the Prelatick Constitution of England. The generality of Ministers Swearing in the Oath of Abjuration, to maintain Erastianism, Prelacy and English Popish Ceremonies. MDCCXVI.

The Right of the House of Stewart to the Crown of Scotland considered, March, 1746, Scots Magazine March 1746, p. 120.

1746, London. Hereditary Right not Indefeasible: Or Some Arguments founded upon the unalterable Laws of Society and Government, proving that the Right claimed by the Jacobites, can never belong to any Prince or Succession of Princes. With proper application to the British Nation, and the Present State of Affairs. With an Appendix, occasioned by the dying Speeches of some of the Rebels. Addressed to Jacobites of all Denominations, by a true Scotchman and lover of his Country.

1746, Logan, J. A Treatise on Government, showing that the right of the Kings of Scotland to the Crown was not strictly and absolutely hereditary.

1746, London. An Earnest Exhortation to a Manly Defence of our Happy Constitution in Church and State. Occasioned by the present unnatural Rebellion. Preached in Mr. Allens Chapel at Prior Park near Bath, and published at his request, by William Warburton.

1746, Edinburgh. A Faithful Portrait of Popery: by which it is seen to be the Reverse of Christianity, as it is the Destruction of Morality, Piety, and Civil Liberty. A Sermon preached at St. James's Church, Westminster, by William Warburton, MA. Chaplain to HRH the Prince of Wales.

1746, Edinburgh. Ignorance and Superstition a Source of Violence and Cruelty, and in particular the cause of the Present Rebellion. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday January 6th, 1746. Upon occasion of the Anniversary Meeting of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, by Robert Wallace, one of the Ministers of Edinburgh.

The Substance of Two Sermons preached in the Tolbooth Church, Edinburgh on the Occasion of the Thanksgiving, June 23rd, 1746, appointed by the late General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, for the Victory obtained over the Rebels at the Battle of Culloden, April 16th, 1746, by Alexander Webster, one of the ministers of the said Church, Edinburgh MDCCXLVI.

1746, Edinburgh. A Comparison of the Spirit of the Whigs and Jacobites: Being the Substance of a Discourse delivered to An Audience of Gentlemen in Edinburgh, December 24, 1745.

1746, London. A Sermon preached at the Cathedral of Salisbury, October 6, 1746, On Occasion of the Rebellion in Scotland, by the Ld. Bp. of Salisbury.

1747, Glasgow. A Sermon preached at the Opening of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr at Glasgow, 7th April, 1747, by David Cooper, Minister at Auchinleck.

1747, Glasgow. A Sermon preached in Commemoration of the Victory obtained at the Battle of Culloden. Preached in the Tron Church Glasgow, April 16, 1747, by James How.

1747, Logan, J. A Second Treatise on Government showing that the Right to the Crown of Scotland was not Hereditary in the sense of the Jacobites.

1747, May. Case of Mr. Thomas Man of Dunkeld, Scots Magazine May, 1747, p. 246.

1747, Reprinted Edinburgh. A Sermon delivered at the South Church in Boston, New England, August, 14, 1746. Being the Day of General Thanksgiving for the Great Deliverance of the British Nations, by the Glorious and Happy Victory near Culloden obtained by HRH Prince William Duke of Cumberland, April 16 in the same year, by Thomas Prince, MA. And a pastor of the said Church, Boston.

Case of Mr. Turnbills Call to Strickathrow (Stracathro), 7th May, 1747, Scots Magazine May 1747, p. 245.

1748, Logan, J. The Finishing Stroke, or Mr. Ruddiman Self condemned.

- 1748, Logan, J. The Finishing Stroke, or Mr. Ruddiman More Self condemned.
- 1748, Edinburgh. A Short Account of the Rise, Progress and Present State of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge. With a Sermon prefixed to it, Preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, Monday January 4, 1748, by Mr. Robert Walker, one of the Ministers of South Leith.
- 1749, Logan, J. The Doctrine of Juro-Divine-ship of Hereditary and Indefeasible Monarchy entered into and exploded in a Letter to Mr. Thomas Ruddiman.
- 1749, Edinburgh. A Vindication of the Licensed Chapels in Scotland. Being an Answer to the Objections exhibited against them, in a letter addressed to the Rev. Mr. Grant at Edinburgh, by Philanthropos (George Blaikie).
- 1750, Edinburgh. The Importance of Religious Knowledge to the Happiness of Mankind. A Sermon preached before the SPCK at their Anniversary Meeting in the High Church of Edinburgh, on Monday January, 1, 1750, by Hugh Blair, AM. One of the Ministers of Canongate, to which is subjoined a Short Account of the present state of the Society.
- A Sermon upon Reformation and Revolution Principles preached before the Synod of Perth and Stirling, April 11, 1750, by Adam Fergusson, Minister of Moulin. Edinburgh MDCCL.
- 1751, Edinburgh. A Sermon upon Reformation and Revolution Principles preached in the Church at Stirling by appointment of the Very Reverend Synod of Perth and Stirling, by Patrick Bannerman, Minister of Kinnoul.
- 1752, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached before the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge, in the High Church of Edinburgh, on Monday, January, 6, 1752, by John Bonar AM, Minister of the Gospel at Cockpen.
- 1752, Edinburgh. A Sermon Preached at the Opening of the Provincial Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale, May 5, 1752, by Gilbert Hamilton, Minister at Cramond.
- 1752, Edinburgh. A State of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge.
- 1753, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, January, 7, 1751, Before the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge. At their Anniversary Meeting, by the late Rev. Mr. Frederick Carmichael, One of the Ministers of Edinburgh.

- 1754, Edinburgh. Religion a Treasure to Men, and the Strength and Glory of a Nation. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh, January 7, 1754 before the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, by Mr. David Plenderleath, Minister at Dalkeith. To which is annexed an Account of the present State of the Schools and Missions supported by the Society.
- 1754, Edinburgh. Zeal for the Civil and Religious Interests of Mankind recommended in a Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh on Thursday, May 23, 1754, at the Opening of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, by Alexander Webster, One of the Ministers of Edinburgh.
- 1755, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached before the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, at their Anniversary Meeting in the High Church of Edinburgh, on Monday, January 6, 1755, by William Robertson, Minister of the Gospel at Gladsmuir.
- 1756, London. The Character of the Pretender by his Secretary, the late Lord Bolingbroke.
- 1756, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached before the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge, at their Anniversary Meeting, in the High Church of Edinburgh, on Monday, January 5, 1756, by John Erskine, Minister of the Gospel at Culross.
- 1759, Edinburgh. A Sermon preached before the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, at their Anniversary Meeting in the High Church of Edinburgh, on Monday January 1, 1759, by Daniel Macqueen, DD. One of the Ministers of Edinburgh.
- 1759, Edinburgh. State of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge. In the Year 1759.
- 1758, Edinburgh. The Absolute Necessity of Salvation through Christ. A Sermon preached before the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, in the High Church of Edinburgh, on Monday, January, 2, 1758, by John Witherspoon, Minister of the Gospel at Paisley.
- 1760, Edinburgh, A Sermon Preached before the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, at their Anniversary Meeting, in the High Church of Edinburgh, on Monday, February 4, 1760, by Patrick Cuming, DD. Regius Professor of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History in the University of Edinburgh, and one of the Ministers of the City.

1760, Edinburgh. The Christians Duty Towards Kings and Those in Authority. Two Sermons upon the Demise of George II, and the Accession of George III, by George Mair, Minister at Cumnock.

1761, Edinburgh. The Influence of Piety on the Public Good. A Sermon preached in the High Church of Edinburgh before His Grace Charles Lord Cathcart, Lord High Commissioner, May 31, 1761, by Alexander Gerard, Professor of Divinity in the Marischal College of Aberdeen.

A Sermon preached before the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, at their Anniversary Meeting, in the High Church of Edinburgh, on Monday, February, 23, 1761, by John Hyndman, One of the Ministers of the West Kirk.

PRINTED BOOKS

(Alphabetical order)

- Aberdeen Burgh Records, Extracts from, 1745-46; New Spalding Club, Vol. I, Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.
- Aberdeen Burgh Records, Extracts from, 1715-16; New Spalding Club, Vol. I, Aberdeen, MDCCCXCV.
- Aberdeen, Earl of Mar and Majistrates of, Correspondence, 1714; New Spalding Club, Vol. I, Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.
- Aberdeen, The Troops at, 1745-46; New Spalding Club, Vol. I, Aberdeen, MDCCCXCV.
- Albemarle Papers, Being the Correspondence of William Anne, Second Earl of Albemarle. Commander in Chief in Scotland, 1746-47. With an Appendix of Letters from Andrew Fletcher, Lord Justice Clerk to the Duke of Newcastle, 1746-48; Ed. C.S. Terry, 2 Vols. New Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1902.
- Alexander, Letter written by Rev. John, of Kildrummy to his wife, 1716; New Spalding Club, Vol. I, Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.
- Alford, Extracts from Presbytery Books of, 1715; New Spalding Club, Vol. I, Aberdeen, MDCCCXCV.
- Alford and Kincardine, Bonds by Heritors in Presbyteries of, to concert Measures for the Peace of the Country, 1700; New Spalding Club, Vol. I, Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.
- Allan, A., History of Channelkirk, James Thin, Edinburgh, 1900.
- Anderson, John, Minister of Dumbarton and of the Ramshorn Kirk, Glasgow, 1698-1721; Scottish Church History Society Records, Vol. IX, Edinburgh, 1947.
- Archibald, J., History of the Episcopal Church at Keith, Moray, 17th-19th Centuries, Edinburgh, 1890.
- Arnot, Hugo, The History of Edinburgh. Turnbull, Edinburgh, 1818.
- Ayr, The Royal Burgh of, Ed., A.I. Dunlop, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1953.
- Bain, George, History of Nairnshire. Telegraph Office, Nairn, 1893.
- Bain, R., History of the Province of Ross, Dingwall, 1899.
- Barty, A.B., The History of Dunblane, Stirling, 1944.

- Beaton, D., Ecclesiastical History of Caithness, Wick, 1909.
- Bentick, C.D., Dornock Cathedral and Parish, Inverness 1926.
- Beveridge, D., Culross and Tulliallan, Vol. II, Edinburgh MDCCCLXXXV.
- Birch, T., Life of Archbishop Tillotson, LONDON, 1753.
- Bisset, Extracts from the Diary of the Rev. John, Minister at Aberdeen, 1745-46. Miscellany of the Spalding Club, Vol. I, Aberdeen, MDCCCXLI.
- Black, D.A., History of Brechin to 1864. Paterson, Edinburgh, 1867.
- Blackwell, Letters from Professor Thomas, to John Ross of Arnage, Miscellany of the Spalding Club, Vol. I, Aberdeen MDCCOXLII.
- Blaikie, W.B., Origins of the Forty-Five. Scottish History Society, Second Series, Vol. II, Edinburgh, 1916.
- Blaikie, W.B., Catalogue of Sermons on the Forty Five Rebellion. Chiefly English, Nos. 37-153. Special Catalogue, Scottish National Library, Edinburgh.
- Blaikie, W.B., Itinerary of Prince Charles Edward Stuart. Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1897.
- Blaikie, W.G., The Preachers of Scotland, 6th-19th Century. Edinburgh, 1888.
- Blatch, W., Memoir of Bishop Low. London, 1855.
- Blundell, Dom Odo, The Catholic Highlands of Scotland. Edinburgh 1909.
- Boxap, H., The Later Jurors. Cambridge, 1924.
- Boyer, Political State of Britain During the Four Last Years of Queen Annes Reign, 1711-14, 7 Vols. MDCCXVIII. London.
- Brown, Hume, The Union of the Parliaments of England and Scotland. Scottish Historical Review, Vol. 4 1907.
- Bryce, W. M., Old Grey Friars Church, Edinburgh. Edinburgh 1912.
- Bulloch, J.M., The Rabbling of Deer. The Book of Buchan, Ed. J.F. Tocher, Peterhead, 1910.
- Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury. Complete Works. British Museum, London.

Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury, History of His Own Times, Vol. II, London (1734).

Bowstead, C.I.H., Facts and Fancies about Kilmaveonaig. Grant, Edinburgh.

Buchan Club Transactions, Vol. III. Notes on Deer Presbytery Records, 1700-1710.

Burleigh, John, Ednam and Its Indwellers. Glasgow, 1912.

Burleigh, J.H.S., A Church History of Scotland. London 1960.

Burton, J.H., The History of Scotland, Vol. 7. Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1897.

Burton, J.H., The Life of Simon Lord Lovat and Duncan Forbes of Culloden. London, 1847.

Calamy, Edmund, An Historical Account of My Own Life, 2 Vols. London (1830).

Cameron, Lees, J., St. Giles, Edinburgh. W. and R. Chambers, Edinburgh, 1889.

Campbell, John, Leaves from the Diary of, an Edinburgh Banker in 1745. Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1893.

Cant, R.C., The University of St. Andrews. Edinburgh, 1946.

Carlyle, Autobiography of Dr. Alexander, 1722-1805, Ed. J.H. Burton. Edinburgh 1910.

Carpenter, E.F., The Protestant Bishop: Henry Compton. London, 1956.

Carpenter, E.F., Thomas Sherlock. London, 1936.

Carpenter, E.F., Thomas Tenison. London (1948).

Carstares State Papers, 1688-1711, Ed. McCormick. Edinburgh MDCCLXXIV. State Papers and Letters addressed to William Carstares relating to public affairs in Great Britain, but more particularly in Scotland, during the reigns of King William and Queen Anne. To which is prefixed the Life of Mr. Carstares by Joseph McCormick.

Chambers, Robert, A Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen, 4 Vols. Glasgow, 1835.

Chambers, Robert, Domestic Annals of Scotland, 3 Vols. Edinburgh and London, 1858-61.

Chambers, Robert, History of the Rebellion in Scotland in 1745, 1746, 2 Vols. Edinburgh, 1827.

Chambers, W., A History of Peeblesshire. W. and R. Chambers, Edinburgh, 1864.

Cheyne, A.C., Inter Church Relations: A Retrospect. Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 12, No. 3. September 1959.

Cheyne, P., The Authority and Use of the Scottish Communion Office Vindicated. Aberdeen MDCCCLIII.

Christian Unity Association Papers. Bishop Sage and his Argument against Presbytery, by Professor Cowan, Aberdeen, p. 156. The Revolution Settlement, by R. W. Weir, p. 102. The Attempts at Comprehension and Union of 1689, by Professor MacEwan, p. 121. Constable, 1914.

Clarke, Peter, A Journal of Several Occurrences in 1715. Scottish History Society, Edinburgh, 1893.

Clarke and Foxcroft, Life of Gilbert Burnet. Cambridge, 1907.

Cleland, James, Annals of Glasgow, Vol. II. Glasgow, 1816.

Clerk, Memoirs of Sir John, of Penicuik, 1676-1755, Ed. J.M. Gray. Scottish History Society, 1892.

Corrie, John, Glencairn. The Annals of an Inland Parish. Dumfries, 1910.

Couper, W.J., Robert Wodrow and His Critics, Scottish Church History Society Records, Vol. V. 1935.

Cramond, W., The Annals of Banff; New Spalding Club, Vol. I. Aberdeen MDCCXCI.

Cramond, W., The Annals of Cullen. Buckie, 1888.

Cramond, W., The Church and Churchyard of Cullen. Aberdeen 1883.

Cramond, W., The Plundering of Cullen House by the Rebels 1745-46. Aberdeen, 1887.

Cramond, W., The Records of Elgin; New Spalding Club, Vol. II. Aberdeen MCMVIII.

Cramond, W., Extracts from Elgin Kirk Session Records. Elgin 1898.

Cramond, W., The Church of Keith. Keith 1888.

- Cranna, John, Fraserburgh Past and Present. The Rosemount Press, Aberdeen, 1914.
- Craven, J.B., Dioceses of Argyll and the Isles, William Peace. Kirkwall, 1907.
- Craven, J.B., A History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Caithness, William Peace. Kirkwall, 1908.
- Craven, J.B., Journals of Bishop Forbes. With a History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ross, 1886.
- Craven, J.B., History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Moray, Skeffington, London, 1889.
- Craven, J.B., History of the Episcopal Church in Orkney, 1688-1912. Kirkwall, 1912.
- Crowther, Gordon, T., The History of Clackmannan, Glasgow, 1936.
- Cruickshank, F., Navar and Lethnot. Brechin MDCCCXCIX.
- Culloden Papers. Correspondence from 1625-1748: Containing Lord Lovat's Letters and Memoirs of Duncan Forbes. London 1815.
- Culloden Papers, Ed. Duncan Warrand. More Culloden Papers, 1626-1747. Inverness 1923-1930.
- Cunningham, A., The Loyal Clans. Cambridge, 1932.
- Cunningham, John, DD., Church History of Scotland 2 Vols. James Thin, Edinburgh, 1882.
- Cuthil, E.C., The Scottish Friend of Frederick the Great, the Last Earl Marischal, 1915.
- Dalrymple, Sir John, Bart., Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland, Vol. I. London, 1771.
- Dalrymple, Sir John, Bart., Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland, Vol. II. Consisting chiefly of Letters from the French Ambassadors in England to their Courts; And from Charles II, King William, and Queen Mary, And the Ministers and Generals of those Princes. London MDCCLXXIII.
- Dawson, A. McD., The Catholics of Scotland from 1593-1852, London, 1890.
- Dicey, A.V., Thoughts on the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland under the Constitution of 1690. Scottish Historical Review, Vol. 14, 1917.

- Dicey and Rait, Thoughts on the Union between England and Scotland. Macmillan, London 1920.
- Dickson, W.K., The Jacobite Attempt of 1719. Edinburgh 1895.
- Dill, R.W., Episcopacy in Forfar. Oliver and McPherson, Forfar, 1911.
- Donald, J.F., Glasgow and the Jacobite Rebellion, 1715. Scottish Historical Review, Vol. XIII, 1916.
- Donaldson, G., Ed., Dickinson and Donaldson: A Source Book of Scottish History, 2nd Edition. London 1961.
- Donaldson, M.E.M., Scotlands Suppressed History, London, 1935.
- Dow, A.C., Ministers to the Soldiers of Scotland. Edinburgh 1962.
- Dowden, John, Scottish Communion Office of 1764. Oxford 1922.
- D'Oyly, G., Life of Archbishop Sancroft, 2 Vols. London, 1821.
- Dunlop, A.I., (Rev.) William Carstares and the Church by Law Established. Chalmers Lectures 1964. Edinburgh 1965.
- Elcho, Lord, Affairs of Scotland, 1744, 1745, 1746. Edinburgh 1907.
- Ellis, Sir Henry, Original Letters, Vol. III (8 Vols). London 1824.
- Estates, Proceedings of the, 1689-90. Scottish History Society, 2 Vols. Ed. Balfour Melville. Edinburgh 1955.
- Every, George, The High Church Party 1688-1718. SPCK. London 1956.
- Falkirk, Two Accounts of the Battle of, New Spalding Club, Vol. I, Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.
- Farquhar, G.T.S., Three Bishops of Dunkeld, Alexander, Rose and Watson. Milne, Tannahill and Methven, Perth, 1915.
- Farquhar, G.T.S., Episcopal History of Perth, 1689-1894. Perth 1894.
- Fasti Aberdonenses, Selections from the Records of the University and Kings College of Aberdeen. Edited by C. Innes. Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1829.
- Fenwick, H., "Divine Right" in Anglican World, Whitson No. 1961.
- Ferguson, R.H., Logie: A Parish History. Paisley 1905.

- Fergusson, Sir James, Argyll in the Forty-Five. London 1951.
- Fergusson, Sir James, John Fergusson, 1727-1750. Jonathan Cape, London, 1948.
- Findlay, J.T., Wolfe in Scotland in the '45 and from 1749 to 1753. London 1928.
- Findlay, J.T., A History of Peterhead. Peterhead 1933.
- Forbes, Robert, The Lyon in Mourning. Ed. Paton. Scottish History Society, 3 Vols. Edinburgh 1896.
- Forbes, Leith, William S.J., Memoirs of Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries, 2 Vols. London 1909.
- Forfeited Estates Papers, A Selection of Scottish Forfeited Estates Papers 1715; 1745. Scottish History Society. Edited by A.H. Millar. Edinburgh 1909.
- Forrester, D.M., Adam Gib: the Anti Burgher. Scottish Church History Society, Vol. VII, 1941.
- Forrester, D.M. Logiealmond. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh 1944.
- Foxcroft, H.C., A Supplement from Unpublished MSS to Burnets History of My Own Times. London 1892.
- Fraser, W.R., History of Laurencekirk. Blackwood, Edinburgh 1880.
- Fraser, W.R., St. Marys of Old Montrose. Blackwood, Edinburgh 1880.
- Frew, D., The Parish of Urr. Dalbeattie 1909.
- Gillies, W.A., In Famed Breadalbane. Perth 1938.
- Goldie, F., A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. London 1951.
- Gordon, James Diary, 1692-1710. Ed. G. D. Henderson and H. H. Porter; Third Spalding Club, Aberdeen MCMXLIX.
- Gordon, J.F.S., The Book of the Chronicles of Keith. Glasgow 1880.
- Graham, H.G., Scottish Men of Letters in the 18th Century. London 1908.
- Graham, H.G., Social Life of Scotland in the 18th Century. London 1901.
- Grant, A. University of Edinburgh during its first 300 years, Vol. I. London 1884.

- Grant, J., History of the Burgh and Parish Schools of Scotland. London and Glasgow, 1876.
- Gray, W.F., Haddington. Edinburgh 1944.
- Grewar, D., The Story of Glenisla. Aberdeen 1926.
- Grievances of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland. Spottiswoode Miscellany, Vol. II. Edinburgh MDCCCXLV.
- Grub, G., Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, Vols. 3-4. Edinburgh, 1861.
- Guthrie, D.O. and Grose, C.L., Forty Years of Jacobite Bibliography. The Journal of Modern History, Vol. XI No. 1. Published in the USA. March 1939.
- Hannay, R.K., Visitation of the University of St. Andrews, 1690. The Scottish Historical Review, Vol. XIII No. 49 October 1915.
- Hart, Tindal. A., The Life and Times of John Sharp Archbishop of York. London (1949).
- Hart, Tindal A., Life of William Lloyd. London 1952.
- Hay, G., History of Arbroath. Arbroath 1876.
- Hay Fleming, D., Critical Reviews Relating Chiefly to Scotland. Edinburgh 1912.
- Henderson, A., Life and Times of the Duke of Cumberland. London 1766.
- Henderson, G.A., The Kirk of St. Ternan, Arbuthnott. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh 1962.
- Henderson, G.D., The Burning Bush. Edinburgh 1957.
- Henderson, G.D., Religious Life in 17th Century Scotland. Cambridge, 1937.
- Henderson, G.D., Mystics of the North East. Third Spalding Club. Aberdeen 1934.
- Highlands, Reports Relating to the, 1724; Reports Relating to the Highlands 1727; New Spalding Club, Vol. I. Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.
- Highlands, Memorial anent the True State of the, as to their Chieftenries, Followings and Dependences before the late Rebellion; New Spalding Club, Vol. I. Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.

- Highland Heritors, Protest by, against giving Bonds for Peaceable Behaviour of Tenants, 1699; New Spalding Club, Vol. I. Aberdeen, MDCCCXCV.
- Highlands, Report of the Committee anent Peace of the, 1699. New Spalding Club, Vol. I. Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission. Report on the Laing MSS in the University of Edinburgh. Vol. I, 1914; Vol. II, 1925.
- Historical MSS, Reports of Commission on; Duke of Hamilton MSS (1887) Supplementary Report (1932); Duke of Athole MSS (1891); Duke of Roxburghe (1894); Earl of Mar and Kellie (1904); Lord Polwarth, Vol. V (1961); CSH Drummond Moray Hist. MSS. Vol. X., Register House, Edinburgh.
- Hill, J.P., The Episcopal Chapel at Muchalls. London 1956.
- Hooches, Colonel, Secret History of, Negotiations in Scotland in 1707. Being the Original Letters and Papers which passed between the Scotch and Irish Lords and the Courts of Versailles and St. Germain. Written by himself. Edinburgh MDCCLX.
- Hooke, Colonel N. Correspondence of. Agent from the Court of Rome to the Scottish Jacobites in the years 1703-1707. Ed. W.D. Macray, 2 Vols. Roxburgh Club. Edinburgh MDCCCLXX.
- Hunter, James., Fala and Soutra. Edinburgh 1892.
- Inglis, J.A., The Last Episcopal Minister of Moneydie. Scottish Historical Review, Vol. 13. 1916.
- Inglis, W.M., An Angus Parish in the 18th Century. Dundee 1904.
- Ingram, M.E., A Jacobite Stronghold of the Church (Old St. Pauls Edinburgh). Grant, Edinburgh 1907.
- Insh, G.P., The Scottish Jacobite Movement. Edinburgh 1952.
- Jacobite Period, Historical Papers Relating to the, 1699-1750. Ed. Colonel James Allardyce; New Spalding Club, Vol. First. Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.
- Jervise, A., The Land of the Lindsays. Edinburgh 1882.
- Jones, G.H., The Main Stream of Jacobitism. Cambridge 1954.
- Keith, Robert, Bishop of Fife. Scottish Bishops. Appendix. With a Life of the Author by M. Russell. Edinburgh, 1824.
- Ken, The Life of Bishop, 2 Vols. London (1854). A Layman (John Anderson).

- Kinnear, G.H., History of Glenbervie. Laurencekirk, 1910.
- Lang, A., The Highlands of Scotland in 1750, from MS 104 in the King's Library, British Museum. Edinburgh 1898.
- Lang, M.B., Whittinghame from Earliest Times. Grant, Edinburgh 1929.
- Lathbury, Thomas., A History of the Non Jurors. London (1845).
- Lawson, J.P., History of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Edinburgh MDCCCXLIII.
- Leven and Melville Papers., Ed. W.L. Melville. The Bannatyne Club. Edinburgh 1843.
- Lockhart Papers. George Lockhart of Carnwath. A Register of Letters twixt the King and George Lockhart of Carnwath containing also a short Account of Public Affairs from 1716 to 1728, 2 Vols. London 1817.
- Lockhart, George, of Carnwath. Memoirs concerning the Affairs of Scotland, from Queen Anne's Accession to the Throne to the Commencement of the Union of the Two Kingdoms, etc. London 1714.
- Lyon, C.J., History of St. Andrew, 2 Vols. Edinburgh 1838.
- McCall, H.B., The Parish of Mid Calder. Edinburgh 1894.
- Macauley, Thomas Babington, Baron, History of England, 8 Vols. London 1862.
- Macdonald, A.S., Memorials of the Forty-Five., Inverness 1930.
- McDowall, W., History of the Royal Burgh of Dumfries. Black Edinburgh 1873.
- MacGregor, George, The History of Glasgow. Glasgow. 1881.
- MacGregor, H.B., Sources and Literature of Scottish Church History. Glasgow 1934.
- MacInnes, John. The Evangelical Movement in the Highlands of Scotland. Aberdeen University Press 1951.
- Mackay, A., Cruden and Its Ministers. Peterhead 1912.
- Mackay, A., Three Scots Bishops and their Association with the Parish of Cruden. Peterhead 1918.
- Mackay, W., Urquhart and Glenmoriston. Inverness 1914.
- Mackay, John, the Church in the Highlands. London 1914.

- McKenzie, W., History of Galloway, Vol. II., Kirkcudbright MDCCCXLI.
- McKerrow, J., History of the Secession Church. Glasgow 1839.
- Mackie, J., Annals of Arngask. Glenfarg, 1958.
- Mackie, J.D., University of Glasgow 1451-1951. Glasgow 1954.
- Mackintosh, A., Lord Ogilvys Regt., Scottish History Society.
Inverness 1914.
- Maclean, D., The Counter Reformation in Scotland 1560-1930.
London 1931.
- Maclean, D., Highland Libraries in the Eighteenth Century.
Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness. Vol. XXXI.
- Maclean, D., The Life and Literary Labours of the Rev. Robert
Kirk, of Aberfoyle: Transactions of the Gaelic Society of
Inverness, Vol. XXXI.
- Maclean, D., The Presbytery of Ross and Sutherland 1693-1700.
Scottish Church History Society Records, Vol. V 1935.
- McMillan, W., The Anglican Book of Common Prayer in the Church of
Scotland. Scottish Church History Society Records, Vol. IV.
1932.
- McMillan, W., The Covenanters after the Revolution of 1688.
Scottish Church History Society Records, Vol. X. 1950.
- McMillan, W., John Hepburn and the Hebronites. Glasgow 1934.
- McNaught, D., Kilmaurs Parish and Burgh. Paisley, 1912.
- Macnaughton, C., Church Life in Ross and Sutherland. From the
Revolution to the present time. Compiled chiefly from the
Tain Presbytery Records. Inverness 1915.
- Macrae, J.E., The Liturgy of the Scottish Non Jurors: Its
Sources and Editions. Scottish Church History Society
Records, Vol. VI, 1938.
- Macrae, N., Romance of a Royal Burgh. Dingwall, 1926.
- McUre, John, Glasghu Facies, 2 Vols. Ed. J.F.S. Gordon. John
Tweed, Glasgow 1872.
- Mair, T., Narratives and Extracts from the Records of the
Presbytery of Ellon. Aberdeen 1898.
- Mar, Proof of Several Persons being forced to the Rebellion 1715
by the Earl of; New Spalding Club, Vol. I. MDCCCXOV.

- Marchmont, Papers of the Earls of, 3 Vols. London MDCCCXXVI.
- Mathieson, W.L., The Awakening of Scotland 1747-1797. Glasgow 1910.
- Mathieson, W.L., Politics and Religion; A Study in Scottish History from the Reformation to the Revolution. Glasgow 1902
- Mathieson, W.L., Scotland and the Union. A History of Scotland from 1695-1747. Glasgow (1905).
- Maxwell, T., The Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence. A Post Revolution Pamphlet. Scottish Church History Records, Vol. VIII, 1944.
- Maxwell, T., Presbyterians and Episcopalians in 1688. Scottish Church History Society Records, Vol. XIII, Part I, 1957.
- Maxwell, W.D., A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland. Oxford University Press 1955.
- Mechie, S., The Office of Lord High Commissioner. Edinburgh 1957.
- Meikle, J., The History of Alyth Parish Church. Edinburgh 1933.
- Meldrum, N., Forteviot. The History of a Strathearn Parish. Paisley, 1926.
- Melville, L., The Fair Land of Gowrie. *Coupar Angus 1939.*
- Menary, George., The Life and Letters of Duncan Forbes of Culloden. Maclehose, London 1936.
- Mitchell, A., Inverness Kirk Session Records 1661-1800. Inverness 1902.
- Mitchell, J.O., Old Glasgow Essays. Macklehose, Glasgow. 1905.
- Mitchell, Diary of Rev. William. Miscellany of the Spalding Club. Vol. I. Aberdeen MDCCCXLI.
- Murray, Memorials of John, of Broughton. Ed. R.F. Bell. Scottish History Society. Edinburgh 1898.
- Moray, Address to the King by the Synod of, 1714-16. New Spalding Club. Vol. I. Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.
- Moray, Extracts from the Records of the Synod of, 1745-46; New Spalding Club. Vol. I. Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.
- Morer, T., Short Account of Scotland. London 1702.

- Morrison, G.H., Boston's Memoirs. Edinburgh 1899.
- Murchison, T.M., The Synod of Glenelg 1725-1821. Notes from the Records. Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness. Vol. XXXVIII (1937-1941).
- Neale, J.M. The Life and Times of Bishop Torry. London MDCCCLVI.
- Nicholas, D., Intercepted Post. August-December 1745. London 1956.
- Nicolsons Bishop, Letters. Scottish History Society. Edinburgh 1893.
- Neish, R., Old Peterhead. Peterhead 1950.
- Noble, John, Religious Life in Ross. Edinburgh 1909.
- Oliphant, T.L.K., The Jacobite Lairds of Gask. London 1870.
- Oliphant, T.T., Historical Notes relating to the Episcopal Congregation at St. Andrews from the Revolution to the present day. Edinburgh 1896.
- Omond, G.W.T., The Lord Advocates of Scotland. Douglas, Edinburgh 1883.
- Overton, J.H., The Non Jurors. London 1902.
- Peeblesshire, A History of, Vol. II. Ed. J. W. Buchan. Jackson Glasgow 1925.
- Petrie, Sir Charles, The Jacobite Movement. The First Phase, the Last Phase, 3rd, Ed., London 1959.
- Philip, A., Parish of Longforgan. Edinburgh 1895.
- Philip, A., The Evangel in Gowrie. Edinburgh 1911.
- Plumptre, E.H., Life of Bishop Ken, 2 Vols. London 1888.
- Pitsligo, Jacobite Letters to Lord, Ed. A. and H. Tayler. Aberdeen 1930.
- Pococke, Richard, Bishop of Meath. Tours in Scotland 1747, 1750, 1760. Scottish History Society, Edinburgh 1887.
- Porteous, Alexander, The History of Crieff. Edinburgh 1912.
- Prebble, John, Culloden. London 1961.
- Proclamations by James VIII, 1743. Proclamations by Prince Charles Edward, 1745; New Spalding Club. Vol. I. Aberdeen MDCCCXCV.

- Prisoners, The, of the Forty-Five. Ed. Seton and Arnot. Scottish History Society, 3 Vols. Edinburgh 1928.
- Privy Council of Scotland, Register of the, Third Series, Vol. 14 1689. Ed. Paton and Hanney. Edinburgh 1933.
- Pryde, G.S., Scotland from 1603 to the Present day, Vol. II Nelson 1962.
- Rae, P., History of the Rebellion, 2nd Edition. With a Collection of Original Letters and Authentick Papers. Edinburgh MDCCXLVI.
- Ramsay, E.B., "The True Position of the Scottish Episcopal Church": A Sermon. Edinburgh 1842.
- Rankin, D.R., The Parish of Carluke. Glasgow 1874.
- Renwick, Robert, Glasgow Memorials. Macklehorse. Glasgow 1908.
- Reid, A., The Royal Burgh of Forfar. Forfar 1902.
- Reid, A., The Regality of Kirriemuir. Edinburgh 1909.
- Revolutions, A Compleat Collection of Papers in 12 Parts relating to the Great, in England and Scotland to the Coronation of King William and Queen Mary, April 11th, 1689. Part 6 relates to Scotland. London 1689.
- Rosebery, Earl of. A List of Persons Concerned in the Rebellion 1745-46. Scottish History Society. Edinburgh 1890.
- Sage, Donald. Memorabilia Domestica or Parish Life in the North of Scotland. Edinburgh 1889.
- Sage, J., The Works of John Sage, a Bishop of the Church in Scotland with a Memoir. London 1844-46.
- Scotichronicon, 3 Vols. Ecclesiastical Chronicle for Scotland. Ed. J.F.S. Gordon. Glasgow MDCCCLXVII.
- Scotland, Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of, 1690-1710; 1711-1725; 1729-1745; 1746-1771.
- Scotland and Scotsmen in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. I. From the MSS of John Ramsay, Esq. of Ochtertyre, Ed. Alexander Allardyce. Blackwood, Edinburgh 1888.
- Scots Magazine, Vols. covering the years 1741-1748. Vols. 3-10. Edinburgh.
- Scott, Hew, Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae, MDCCCLXXI, Original Edition. Revised and Enlarged Edition. Vols. 1-7, 1915-1927.
- Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, Vols. 1, 8, 12. Edinburgh 1851-1863.

- Scottish Population Statistics, Edited by J.G. Kydd, S.H.S.,
Edinburgh 1952.
- Seafield Correspondence from 1685-1708. Ed. James Grant.
University Press Edinburgh 1912.
- Sharp, Thomas, The Life of John Sharp, 2 Vols. London (1825).
- Skinner, J., Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, With a Biographical
Memoir. Forfar 1818.
- Skinner, J., An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, Vol. II
London 1838.
- Skinner, J. Bishop. Primitive Truth and Order Vindicated.
Aberdeen 1803.
- Somers Tracts. First Collection 3 Vols LONDON MDCCXLVIII;
Second Collection, Revised, 4 Vols. 1750; Third Collection
4 Vols. 1751; Fourth Collection, 4 Vols. 1751.
- Somerville, Thomas, History of Great Britain during the reign
of Queen Anne. London 1798.
- Spottiswoode, Miscellany. A Collection of Original Papers and
Tracts illustrative chiefly of the Civil and Ecclesiastical
History of Scotland, Vol. II. Edinburgh MDCCCXLV.
- St. Pauls, The Register of, Episcopal Chapel, Aberdeen. The
Miscellany of the New Spalding Club, Second Volume. Ed.
Alexander Emslie Smith. Aberdeen 1908.
- Stair, Annals and Correspondence of the Viscount and the First
and Second Earls of, Vol. II. Ed. John Murray Graham.
Blackwood. Edinburgh 1875.
- State Tracts, A Collection of, During the Reign of King William
III, 3 Vols. Vol. 3, Relates to Scotland. London MDCCCV.
- Stephen, T., History of the Church of Scotland, 4 Vols. London
MDCCCXLIV.
- Stephen, W., History of the Scottish Church, Vol. II. Edinburgh
1896.
- Stewart, A., A Highland Parish. Maclaren, Glasgow, 1928.
- Stirling, R. McD., Inveresk Parish Lore. Musselburgh 1894.
- Stirton, J., Glamis, A. Parish History. Forfar, 1913.
- Stonywood, Letters to the Laird of, Miscellany of the Spalding
Club, Vol. I. Aberdeen MDCCCXLI.

- Story, R.H., William Carstares. London 1874.
- Stoughton, J., Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges. London MDCCCLXXVIII.
- Straka, G.M., Problems in European Civilization. The Revolution of 1688. Whig Triumph or Palace Revolution? Heath 1963.
- Sykes, Norman, William Wake Archbishop of Canterbury 1657-1737, 2 Vols. Cambridge, 1957.
- Tayler, Alistair and Henrietta, The Jacobites of Aberdeenshire and Banffshire in the Forty-Five. Aberdeen 1928.
- Tayler, A. and H., Jacobites of Aberdeenshire and Banffshire in the Rising of 1715. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh 1934.
- Tayler, Alistair and Henrietta, 1745 and After. Nelson, Edinburgh 1938.
- Tayler, A. and H., 1715. The Story of the Rising. London 1936.
- Tayler, A. and H., The Stuart Papers at Windsor. London 1939.
- Tayler, H., The Jacobite Court at Rome in 1719. Scottish History Society, Edinburgh 1938.
- Terry, C.S., The Rising of 1745. With a Bibliography of Jacobite History. London 1903.
- Tocher, J.F., Note on the Bicentenary of Prince James's Landing at Peterhead. Transactions of Buchan Field Club. 1913-1917 Vol. XI.
- Tocher, T.F., The Book of Buchan. The Buchan Club 1910.
- Thomson, A., Lauder and Lauderdale, Galashiels 1902.
- Thomson, J. Pringle, The Jacobite Rebellions (1689-1746). London 1914.
- Tod, J. Protestant Episcopacy in Great Britain in relation to Apostolic Succession, illustrated specially by reference to the case of the Scottish Episcopal Church. London 1889.
- Trevælyan, G.M., England Under Queen Anne. London 1930.
- Turnbull, The Diary of the Rev. John, Minister of Alloa and Tynninghame, 1657-1704. Scottish History Society. Edinburgh 1893.
- Walker, W., Memoir of Bishop Gleig of Brechin. Edinburgh 1878.
- Walker, W., The Life of the Rt. Rev. Alexander Jolly DD. Edinburgh 1878.

Walker, W., Life and Times of John Skinner of Linshart, Dean of Aberdeen. London 1883.

Warrick, J., The History of Old Cumnock. Paisley 1899.

Warrick, J., The Moderators of the Church of Scotland 1690-1740. Edinburgh 1913.

Watt, W., Aberdeen and Banff. Blackwood 1900.

Wilkie, James, The History of Fife. Blackwood, Edinburgh 1924.

Wilson, D., Memorials of Edinburgh, Vol. I. Black Edinburgh 1891.

Wilson, John, Dunning, A Parish History. Crieff 1906.

Wilson, W., Airlie, A Parish History. Coatbridge, 1917.

Wodrow, The Correspondence of the Rev. Robert, Edited by T. McCrie. Wodrow Society, Edinburgh, 1842-43, 3 Vols.

Wodrow, Robert, Analecta, 4 Vols. Edited for the Maitland Club by Rev. Dr. Leishman. Edinburgh 1842-43.

Wodrow, Robert. Early Letters of Robert Wodrow 1698-1709. Edited from the Manuscript in Edinburgh University Library by L. W. Sharp. Edinburgh 1937.